









**THE**  
**EDINBURGH REVIEW.**

**VOL. XCI.**



THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,  
OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
*January 1850*  
OCTOBER, 1849 . . . . APRIL, 1850.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

VOL. XCI.

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS, LONDON  
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,  
EDINBURGH.

1850.

6521

the Library

no. 1.4.75

LONDON :  
SPOTTISWOODES and SHAW,  
New-street-Square.

# CONTENTS OF No. CLXXXIII.

---

	Page
ART. I.—1. Report of the select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland, together with the Minutes of Evidence. 1847.	
2. Ditto. 1848.	
3. Emigration. Papers presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. 1847-8-9.	
4. A View of the Act of Colonization. E. G. Wakefield. 1849.	
5. The Colonies of England. By J. A. Roebuck, Esq. M. P.	
6. Answer to the Question what is to be done with the unemployed Labourers of the United Kingdom. By John Robert Godley.	
7. Principles of Political Economy. By John Stewart Mill,	1
II.—1. Observations on the Necessity of adopting Legislative Measures to diminish the Recurrence of Fatal Accidents in Collieries, and to prolong the Duration of the Coal Mines of the Kingdom. By W. Chapman, Civil Engineer.	
2. The National Importance of preserving Mining Records. By T. Sopwith, F. G. S. 1844.	
3. A Bill for establishing District Registers of all Mines and Mining Operations in England and Wales. Printed by Order of the House of Commons, Aug. 1844,	62
III.—1. Mr. Berwick's Report to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on the Occurrences which took place in the District of Castletwellan, on the occasion of an Orange Procession on the 12th of July, 1849. Dublin Evening Post, 17th October, 1849.	
2. Battle of Magheramayo. Printed by James Henderson, Newry. 1849,	87
IV.—History of Greece. By George Grote, Esq. Vols. III. and IV. 1847. Vols. V. and VI. 1849. 8vo.,	118

	Page
ART. V.— <i>Shirley: a Tale.</i> By Currer Bell, Author of 'Jane Eyre.' Smith, Elder, and Co. 1849, . . .	153
VI.— <i>Négociations de la France dans le Levant; ou Correspondance, Mémoires, et Actes Diplomatiques des Ambassadeurs, de France à Constantinople, et des Ambassadeurs, Envoyés, ou Résidents à divers titres à Venise, Raguse, Rome, Malte, et Jerusalem; en Turquie, Perse, Géorgie, Crimée, Syrie, Egypte, etc. et dans les états de Tunis, d'Alger, et de Maroc. Publiés pour la première fois. Par S. Charrière. Tome I. (1515—1547.) Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1848, . . .</i>	173
VII.—1. Report of the General Board of Health on the Measures appointed for the Execution of the Nuisances-removal and Diseases-prevention Act, and the Public Health Act, up to July, 1849. Presented to Parliament.	
2. Report on Quarantine by the General Board of Health. Presented to Parliament, 1849.	
3. Statement of the Course of Investigation and Results of Experiments as to the Means of Removing the Refuse of Towns in Water, and applying it as Manure. By Edwin Chadwick, Esq. C.B. Reynell and Weight, 1849, . . .	210
VIII.— <i>Histoire de la Révolution de 1848.</i> By A. de Lamartine. 2 tomes. Paris: 1849, . . .	228

# CONTENTS OF No. CLXXXIV.

---

	Page
<b>ART. I.—</b>	
1. Astronomical Observations made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, in the Year 1847. Under the Direction of George Biddell Airy, Esq., M.A., Astronomer Royal.	
2. Magnetical and Meteorological Observations made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, in the Year 1847. Under the Direction of George Biddell Airy, Esq., M.A., Astronomer Royal.	
3. Reduction of Observations of the Planets made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, from 1750 to 1830. Computed by Order of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, under the Superintendence of George Biddell Airy, Esq., M.A., Astronomer Royal. 4to. 1845.	
4. Reduction of Observations of the Moon, from 1750 to 1830. By G. B. Airy, Esq. 2 vols. 4to. 1848.	
5. Description de l'Observatoire Central de Poulkova. Par F. G. W. Struve. St. Petersburg, 1845. Fol.	
6. A Cycle of Celestial Objects observed, reduced, and discussed. By Captain Wm. Henry Smyth, R. N., &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 1844.	
7. Six Lectures on Astronomy, delivered at Meetings of the Friends of the Ipswich Museum. By George Biddell Airy, Esq., M.A., Astronomer Royal. 8vo. 1849, . . . . .	2 99
 <b>II.—</b> Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the Years 1804, 1805, 1806. By the late Rev. Sydney Smith, M.A., London: 1849. Pp. 424. . . . .	
	356
 <b>III.—</b>	
1. First and Second Reports of the Commissioners for enquiring into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts. London: 1844 and 1845.	
2. First, Second, and Third Reports of the Metropolitan Sanitary Commission. London: 1847 and 1848.	
3. Historical and Statistical Account of the Present System of supplying the Metropolis with Water.	



	Page
By Joseph Fletcher, Esq. Journal of the Statistical Society of London. June, 1845.	
4. Supply of Water to London from the River Thames at Henley. London: 1849, . . .	377
IV.—1. The Hellenics of Walter Savage Landor, enlarged and completed. London: 1847.	
2. The Collected Works of Walter Savage Landor. In two vols. medium 8vo. London: 1846.	
3. Poemata et Inscriptiones, novis auxit Savagius Landor. London: 1847, . . .	408
V.—1. Polynesia (Edinburgh Cabinet Library). By the Right Reverend M. Russell, LL. D. and D. C. L. Edinburgh: 1842.	
2. A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands. By the Reverend John Williams, of the London Missionary Society. London: 1840.	
3. History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands. By James Jackson Jarves. London: 1843.	
4. Travels in New Zealand. By Ernst Dieffenbach, M. D. London: 1843.	
5. Lawry's Visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands. London: 1850, . . .	443
VI.—1. An Examination of some prevailing Opinions on the Subject of Taxation in this and other Countries. By Geo. Warde Norman, Esq. London: 1850.	
2. Rapport Général, présenté par M. Thiers au nom de la Commission de l'Assistance Publique. Paris: 1850.	
3. Latter-day Pamphlets. No. I. By Thomas Carlyle. London: 1850, . . .	471
VII.—1. The Village Notary. A romance of Hungarian Life. Translated from the Hungarian of Baron Fötvös, by Otto Wenckstern. With Introductory Remarks by Francis Pulszky. 3 vols. post 8vo. London: 1850.	
2. Memoirs of a Hungarian Lady. By Theresa Pulszky. With an Historical Introduction by Francis Pulszky. 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1850.	
3. Genesis der Revolution in Oesterreich, im Jahre 1848. 8vo. pp. 418. Leipzig: 1848.	
4. Ungarns Verfassung. Beurtheilt von Dr. J. Wildner, Edlen von Maithstein, Indigena von Ungarn. 8vo. pp. 130. Leipzig: 1849.	

5. Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte. Von Arthur Frey. 3 vols. med. 8vo. Mannheim: 1849.
  6. Enthüllungen aus Oesterreich's jüngster Vergangenheit. Von einem Mitgliede der linken des aufgelösten Oesterreichischen Reichstages. 8vo. pp. 282. Hamburg: 1849.
  7. Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeits Krieg, nach den besten Quellen und zahlreichen Mittheilungen Ungarischer Notabilitäten dargestellt. Von Dr. A. Schütte. 2 vols. 8vo. Dresden: 1850.
  8. Die letzten Tage der Magyarischen Revolution. Enthüllungen der Ereignisse in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen, seit dem 1sten July, 1849. Von Alexander Szilagyí. Leipzig: 1850.
  9. Letters from the Danube. By the Author of 'Gisella.' 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1847.
  10. A Voice from the Danube; or the True State of the Case between Austria and Hungary. By an Impartial Observer. Pp. 212. 8vo. London: 1850. 497
- VIII.—An Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion. By George Cornwall Lewis, Esq. London: 1849, . . . . . 508
- IX.—1. Debate on the Address. 1850.  
 2. Speeches at Protection Meetings. 1849–50.  
 3. Address of the National Association for the Protection of Industry. 1850.  
 4. Board of Trade Returns for the Year 1849, . . . . . 558
- X.—1. Rückblick auf die Entwicklung der Deutschen Angelegenheiten im Jahre 1849. (Retrospect of the developement of German Affairs in the year 1849.) Berlin: 1850.  
 2. Preussen und seine politische Stellung zu Deutschland und den Europäischen Staaten von Bülow-Cummerow. (Prussia and her Political Relation to Germany and the States of Europe.) Berlin: 1849.  
 3. An Heinrich Gagern; eine Stimme aus dem Deutschen Volke. (To Henry Gagern; a Voice from the German People.) Stuttgart: 1849.  
 4. Political Letters on Germany. By Germanicus. (In the 'Globe' Newspaper.) . . . . . 584





THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW

JANUARY, 1850.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. CLXXXIII.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Report of the select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland, together with the Minutes of Evidence.* 1847.
2. *Ditto.* 1848.
3. *Emigration.* Papers presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1847–8–9.
4. *A View of the Act of Colonization.* E. G. WAKEFIELD. 1849.
5. *The Colonies of England.* By J. A. ROEBUCK, Esq. M.P.
6. *Answer to the Question what is to be done with the unemployed Labourers of the United Kingdom.* By JOHN ROBERT GODLEY.
7. *Principles of Political Economy.* By JOHN STEWART MILL.

THE progress recently made by Colonization, as a question of public interest, cannot have escaped the least attentive observer. That progress has been rapid as well as steady; and may be measured from month to month as well as from year to year. Colonization has been the subject of numberless books and pamphlets, and has afforded a frequent topic to the periodical press. Public meetings have been held in many parts of England; tracts have been circulated; the attention of Parliament has been again and again directed to it: in short all those signs have been exhibited which commonly precede some important legislative proceeding. Yet hitherto legislation has done

but little in the matter: and the question is practically much where it was before the motion of the late lamented Mr. Charles Buller, or even before the earlier exertions of Mr. Wilmot Horton. There are still persons who deny that we suffer from a redundant population: but a larger number are contented to affirm that its removal would prove too arduous and costly an enterprise. The former class are the loudest in their opposition to colonization, the latter are the more efficient. It is well known, however, that mere difficulties of detail often retard the introduction of measures of obvious necessity. This has been the case with the question of Sanitary Reform, and with the yet more momentous question of Education: but such difficulties diminish as they are looked in the face, and vanish when closely confronted; so that, when the great measure, which has a hundred times been pronounced to be alike desirable and impracticable, is at last carried, men ask, as in the story of Columbus's egg, where the difficulty lay? Achievements in the political, like discoveries in the scientific world, are for the most part heralded by precursive signs; and we have already had on the subject of Colonization those dawnlights which prognosticate the day.

Nor can we at all wonder at the growing interest with which this topic is regarded. The kindred subject of Pauperism has for a long series of years engrossed a large share of public attention: but, frequently as it has been the theme of the philosopher and the economist, no efficient remedy has as yet been devised. We can travel at the rate of fifty miles an hour, and send intelligence a thousand miles in a minute; we have not been able, however, to outstrip pauperism. Wealth has accumulated: social improvements have been carried out; and political changes have taken place, only less than revolution; but our national Genius yet stands rebuked before the one gaunt phantom which meets it on every path of triumph. A few years ago pauperism threatened to swallow up all property: the Poor-law was amended, and the disease in some measure checked; but pauperism has again for several years been on the increase. In Ireland distress has passed into famine, occasioned by the loss of the potato; and all that has been done for that country has failed to avert an unprecedented mortality, an enormous destruction of property, and (the consequence of such calamities) a deep-seated and wide-spread discontent. The potato was the staple of Irish agriculture, as cotton is that of the manufactures of Lancashire. What would be the consequence, if a loss analogous to that which Ireland has sustained were to deprive England of her chief manufacturing material? It is

impossible not to ask ourselves, if pauperism continues to increase at a period of comparative tranquillity,—while our commerce thrives, and our unfinished railroads employ industrial armies, what may we not expect at those periods of disaster from which no wisdom can secure us? In what would then consist our defence? Certainly not in any of those convulsive political changes, which are rendered abortive by the same discontent that produces them.

‘Slowly comes a hungry people, as a lion, creeping nigher,  
Glares at one that nods and winks behind a slowly dying fire.’

When the calamity is upon us, it may be too late to provide for our safety.

But it is not only when we contemplate English or Irish pauperism, that we are reminded of the dangers arising from the pressure of population on the means of subsistence. Those dangers are illustrated by the condition of half Europe at the present day. We are far indeed from asserting that the recent wars of nation against nation, and of class against class, have been produced by that cause alone. Other agencies we know have been at work; But all other evil influences assuredly were aggravated by that chronic discontent which gives plausibility even to such agitators as the Red Republicans of Paris, and to such philosophers as her Socialists. Each of the three French Revolutions affected all Europe; but the disastrous infection of the last, spread over the Continent as flame spreads over the dry grass of the prairie. For so terrible an excitement there must have been predisposing causes; and the chief, we may assume, among those causes, was the galling uneasiness which frets a population too closely packed to find an easy subsistence. In the United States and in Russia, two countries with few points of resemblance, there is one thing in common—a territory sufficient for all; and in each there is a common absence of those signs which forebode a social war. In the revolution of February, on the other hand, it is well known how largely the unemployed labourers of Paris contributed to the overthrow of the monarchy. Neither the minute subdivision of property, nor the boasted field which Algeria had long supplied to the ‘*émmentiers*’ of France, nor the slow rate at which for several years her population had been advancing, nor yet the growing power of that middle class whose interests are identified with peace, were sufficient to avert a revolution, the first effect of which was to increase distress tenfold. Heated populations are always

at the mercy of accidents; and in the body politic, a scratch may be fatal,—if the blood be diseased.

It is not, however, our intention to enlarge on either the political or the economical dangers of pauperism. Its Moral evils lie deeper; and for that reason, perhaps, have attracted less general attention. Had the insidious nature of those evils been duly appreciated, more energetic efforts would, doubtless, before now have been made to remove the disease from which they spring. At so large a subject, we can but glance. But we must be allowed to say a word on those moral relations at the very centre of our being, on which all others rest. In a nation vitiated and enfeebled by permanent pauperism, the domestic ties, if they can be said truly to exist, are too often reversed from their natural offices. We speak now of pauperism as it affects civilised communities. We have all heard of the Indian mother who day by day carried her dead child through the frozen woods, and night after night, suspended his cradle of reeds upon the branches beneath which she slept,—and nowhere could fix upon a spot in which to bury him! Among barbarous tribes, nature, which has neither been elevated nor vitiated by the conventions of society, may thus vindicate her rights to the last. But with those who are surrounded by a prosperity which they may not share, and upbraided by respectabilities sharply contrasted with their squalor, the case is far otherwise. The children of the actual pauper, habituated to the workhouse, may be no hindrance to him. They are orphans already. But for every actual pauper there are many paupers in expectation; and it is in this fact that the most malignant evil of pauperism lies. If a man be still struggling upon the inclined plane beneath which lies that form of dependence which neither affection nor reciprocal service redeems, his children are his chief enemies. They are the chains about his feet, and the reproach before his eyes. He feels that if they did not exist he would be free; he could seek employment elsewhere; he could have the hill-side if not the valley; and if nothing belonged to him, he would at least belong to himself. Nor is this the worst. It is in the moral part of his being that he suffers most; and the less degraded he is, the more must he suffer. His wife and his children can but remind him of engagements unfulfilled and trusts betrayed. In that career of courage and of virtue, the dignity of which is perhaps greatest when exhibited in humble life, his sons and his daughters can have no part. They have been defrauded even of their opportunities,—and have miserably ‘lost the race they never ran.’ The gin-shop, if it can shelter him from their looks, their words, or their silence, is his quietest asylum. For the wounds which

the heart inflicts on itself, the heart takes a terrible revenge. Whether it be assailed wittingly or unwittingly, it arms itself against its persecutors, in hostility or in indifference. The offspring of the inferior animals are bound to them by no abiding tie. Too often the offspring of paupers are as little loved, though less easily cast off. They came undesired; they remained to oppress and insult; they never looked like children:—from infancy they were lawless as manhood, and querulous as old age; they grew up a greater burden to themselves than to others. Love, it is said, is ‘stronger than death’: It is not stronger than pauperism. Not long since public attention was attracted, less pointedly, perhaps, than it would once have been, by the case of a mother who had successively murdered every one of her children, applying arsenic to the breast which they sucked! She betrayed no signs of remorse; remarking merely that she had saved her children from the troubles she had herself endured. The aberrations of crime, like those of madness, are often ominous illustrations of tendencies still held in check. But even had that wretched woman restricted her wickedness within safer bounds, those children could never have been to her as children.

If that one of the affections which is most propped by instinct, can be thus subverted; if parents can, at periods of distress, neglect their children to the death, or at periods of large employment can live in sloth upon their labour, defrauding them of rest and education, it is impossible that the other human relations should escape the corruption. Children whose parents have not loved or ruled them with a true, parental heart, will, at the hearth itself, look round for parents in vain. Men and women are no doubt visible and palpable beings; but there is nothing in their merely outward semblance by which Father or Mother, brother or sister, can be truly recognised. As well might we endeavour to look beyond the mead, the lawn, and the wood, and behold our country, with the bodily eye alone. These sacred relations belong not to the material world; the senses take no cognisance of them: Like all things of inward significance and permanent worth, we discern them only through the immaterial part of our nature—the affections, the moral sense, and religious faith. A child no more beholds an earthly than a heavenly parent, merely with the outward eye; but his heart inherits a belief in each; and with each he becomes acquainted through outward signs and symbols. Without a parental heart, a parent may be to his children as a relieving officer, or a schoolmaster, or a gaoler, or a guardian, or the union of all these: but a father he cannot be; and not showing himself as such, all the devout impulses of filial love, reverence, and awe



must shrink back rebuked, and die in the bosom of the child. With the parental the fraternal tie is simultaneously relaxed; and the petty emulations of childhood, like the petty emulations of manhood, soon convert brethren into rivals. Where there is no feeling of kin, there will be no true feeling of kindness, though there may exist capricious likings as well as dislikes. The sanctities of home, like other sanctities, are at best too easily secularised; and a household which has never been swayed by a genuine spirit of parental love, is as a world would be without a ruling Providence or a God.

We have remarked that, in comparison with yet graver calamities, a disproportionate importance has sometimes been attached to the *political* evils of pauperism. And yet the most important of them has seldom been regarded. We allude to the decay of Patriotism. Insubordination and discontent are dangers which at least admit of being distinctly scanned, if not permanently repressed. A decline in the patriotic sentiment is an injury more dangerous because more insidious. Negative evils are ever those which least admit of cure. With the domestic affections that patriotic sentiment, which encompasses and unites the great family of the nation, must, at all times, proportionably decline. We hear little now of that cosmopolite philosophy, once popular, which inveighed against the narrowness of the domestic affections as inconsistent with patriotism, and against patriotism itself as a limitation of what man should cultivate — universal philanthropy. The old truth has fought its way back again into the light; and few now deny that it is through these narrower and deeper channels that the human sympathies advance in their course, till they overflow and fertilise wider fields. What is it that makes a man's country sacred to him? The fact that it is the enlarged and multiplied image of his childhood's home. We call our country *patria* or *fatherland*, because, with a paternal providence, it had provided for our earliest wants, before we ourselves became acquainted with them; and because, with a paternal discipline, it continues to marshal the order of our lives and duties. The charities of neighbourly life, the genial enjoyments of friendly society; — nay the amenities of hill and dale, and the stillness of sheltered nooks, — whether confessionals of the heart, cells for study, or retreats whence youthful aspirations direct their steadiest flight; — these things, together with the manners of our country, her traditions, and her language, enter into our constitution like a mother's milk, and disperse themselves through the remotest currents of our being: But such associations would have no centre to cling to, if the great idea of Country had not already

grown up in us beside the domestic hearth; — and that idea will be realised, only in proportion as the filial and parental relations have been realised. The fraternal tie not less flings its glorified reflection upon the farthest horizon of our native land. Our fellow countrymen are our brethren, not in name only, but in truth; and it may, without profaneness, be said, that he who does not love his brother whom he hath seen, can hardly love his country which he hath not seen.

There are other influences likewise which aid in building up the patriotic sentiment. — But they too proceed mainly from the moral sense and from the imagination; both of which have a chance of being hurried and hustled out of the world, by the selfishness and want of leisure which accompany over-population, and the high-pressure system it gives rise to. Morally, a man is attached to his country by the benefits she has conferred on him, — by the large degree in which his daily toils, if rightly directed, subserve her interests and promote her greatness, — and by the fact, that it is in and through her that Providence has bestowed upon him his place in universal being, here and hereafter. But what benefit has his country bestowed on the Pauper? She feeds him, — and loathes him. Not seldom her best intended charities produce or add to his degradation; her most needful restrictions in the exercise of such charity, entail upon him privation and insult: finally, she buries him. How has he promoted her welfare in return? He has added to her burdens, detracted from her glory, and preyed upon her strength. He has been, at best, the weed cumbering her garden, and the moth fretting her garment. What cause has he to be grateful to her for the part which she has given him in existence? Will he not rather say with our first parent:

‘ Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay  
To mould me man?’

And assuredly the imagination will, in his case, as little as the moral sense, minister to patriotism. He who is a blot on his country’s present well-being, can have no care for her past or future greatness. From that high imaginative fellowship which binds together, throughout the breadths of space and the long succession of time, the children of one sea-girt isle, he was excommunicated, before he was born. As well might the mildew claim to be the leaf, as he claim a place, from the lowest root to the topmost spray, in his country’s tree of honour.

It is the wide diffusion of pauperism, as well as the depth within our personal nature to which it descends, that renders the

cure so difficult. Its economical evils may be limited; but the habitudes, tone of sentiment, and mode of perception which it engenders, rise from the lower level, and infect all classes of society. Those who are themselves morally diseased are not the best physicians. They are apt to take indulgent views of dangerous symptoms; and good advice, especially if founded on pecuniary considerations, does not always come with a good grace from those who, in the estimate of the party receiving it, may be pleading for their pockets.

We have heard of innumerable plans for meeting the evil; — home colonies — the allotment system — the settlement of paupers on waste lands; but such plans have ever proved fallacious or wholly insufficient, when compared with the magnitude and progress of the evil. Still wilder schemes are broached. Quadri-lateral communities and social parallelograms have been devised, by philosophers whose mathematical skill has not yet succeeded in squaring the circle of existence. A more rational solution of the problem has a very different class of men for its advocates; their reliance is on abstinence from, or on the postponement of, marriage. That imprudent marriages are always objectionable, not only on economical, but on moral grounds, is abundantly certain; but there is surely no inconsistency between this proposition and another not less important, — namely, that when prudent marriages commonly mean marriages unnaturally deferred, society must be in a state not favourable to virtue or to happiness. The proposed remedy, however, need not, at present, be discussed, in any point of view except that of its practicability and sufficiency. In times of actual famine, both population and marriages will be rapidly diminished, without the aid of any advice. As to the effect of such counsels at other times, we may form some judgment from the fact, that perseveringly as they have been bestowed during the last half century, they have been but sparingly acted on, where needed most. The amount of the evil is itself one reason why it cannot thus alone be remedied. The prudential check, as recommended, supposes a high standard of life: while one effect of our large population is, that we sink to a low one. Among men habituated to privation or dependence, all but the necessities of life will be classed among unattainable luxuries. Life is short, but social suffering is long; and the traveller cannot afford to wait for the only refuge open to him, till the stream of national pauperism has flowed past. The 'hope deferred' is not the hope that makes the heart strong; and when no other comforts exist for a man, he is driven upon the most sacred, although at the risk of desecrating them. One of the

evils of a depressed condition is, that lending itself alike to indolence and recklessness, it surrenders to the impulse of the moment, and renounces that graver happiness which sows that it may reap. In Ireland, as we shall see hereafter, it is in the most wretched districts that population has hitherto advanced most rapidly. In Switzerland and Lombardy, on the other hand, in which there exists, not a mere labouring population, but a class of peasant proprietors, and generally a comfortable yeomanry, the rate of increase has been slow. Frugality, foresight, and self-denial, whatever place they may occupy in the scale of virtues, are qualities not produced in any country by poverty and wretchedness. In other words, the high standard of life by which population is to be kept in due proportion with the means of subsistence, must be a standard which actually exists, and not one which we simply wish to exist. ‘Cannot people,’ it will be asked, ‘be educated to it?’ The instruction of schools may improve, but can neither reverse nor supersede, the far more efficient education which comes from daily life. A man is educated by every thing he sees and hears, from the time he awakens to the time he goes to sleep: and so long as the training of daily habits and of social relations leads directly to pauperism, the best that can be hoped from a merely literary education is, that it will not drive a chronic disease to a premature and perilous crisis.

A remedial measure, of late powerfully advocated among us, is the creation of a class of peasant proprietors. Such a scheme has much to recommend it, and on many grounds. Whether it might or might not lead to the most reproductive investment of capital, it would not only increase the security of property by widening its basis, but it would elevate the condition of the people, by breeding up an important class in habits of dignified yet unambitious independence. Such a class cannot, however, any more than an order of nobility, be created by a fiat of the State. It must win its spurs. Most desirable indeed is it to remove all obstacles to its existence, — all impediments, for instance, to the sale of estates in small portions, thus enabling the frugal and self-denying to invest their savings in land. The first requisites for the success of such a class must be energy and agricultural skill. Their peculiar position as proprietors, would, of itself, foster either industry or indolence, according as the one quality or the other preponderated in the parties; and if, therefore, instead of gaining that position in the course of a fair rivalry between the small and the large capitalist, they were suddenly and arbitrarily raised by the interference of the State, consequences the reverse of those hoped for would probably ensue, —

consequences more analogous to those which have been witnessed in Ireland in the case of old and immoderately long leases. This is especially to be remembered, when schemes are put forward binding together the establishment of peasant proprietors with the reclamation by the State of Irish waste lands. The endeavour to effect two objects together would be likely in this instance, as in many others, to prove incompatible with the right execution of either. The new proprietors would be exposed to the severest trial in being planted upon wild land, ever apt to relapse into heath and swamp; and they would at the same time be deprived of those incitements and aids which, were they scattered among the community at large, they would derive from the example of their neighbours. Moreover, the lands in question would not, even after a vast expenditure of capital, be capable, according to ordinary calculation, of sustaining more than half a million of persons; and it is to be borne in mind that, if peasant properties be not small indeed, their first tendency must be to stimulate the increase of numbers, however at a later period they may restrict it.

Let us look the evil then, boldly in the face; for thus only can we estimate the magnitude of the remedies required. It advances with our prosperity, until our moral \* writers speak with bitter scorn of that 'enchanted gold' which makes all things barren. It advances with our growing knowledge, until our philosophers † confess with remorse, that 'hitherto it is questionable 'if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the 'day's toil of any human being.' It advances with our political reforms, the latest of which leaves behind a discontent the more dangerous because less capable of being appeased. It advances in spite of our efforts to promote the cause of religion and of education. One new church is built where four might seem necessary; and yet it remains half empty: new schools spring up day by day; yet so rapid is the increase of crime that how to dispose of criminals, now that the colonies refuse to feed on our offal, is a question which our most thoughtful statesmen strive in vain to resolve. So great, in short, is the evil, that some economists who solve financial questions on 'the high priori ground' of theology, refuse to believe it, and 'vindicate the ways' of Providence, after a fashion that Providence speedily disowns, — by boldly asserting that population has not, even in old communities, a tendency to advance more rapidly than production. This doctrine finds a ready acceptance

---

\* Carlyle, *Chartism*.

† John Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, vol. ii. p. 312.

with our natural instincts, which, more wise in the principles to which they point than in the application of those principles (on which they stumble), affirm that 'where God sends mouths 'he will send food;' but more feelingly experience the truth of an adage as old,—that 'where there is a back there will be a 'burden;'—and often a burden hard to be borne.

And yet with such errors who would not at first be disposed to sympathise? The complaint is an old one, that neither plague, pestilence, nor famine inflicts upon the human race such injuries as man inflicts on man. A bitterer irony remains behind, in the fact that the most deep-seated of such injuries are not those engendered by barbarous hatred and sustained in battle, but those which grow up amid civilised communities, in times of peace, through the influence of the best affections, and among men each one of whom desires but to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, and to serve his neighbour while he supports himself! The paradox is a sad one. No land ever yet complained of its too abundant flocks and herds: yet the weight of a redundant population may press the very life out of virtue,—nay, the very soul out of human nature. Her mines and her soil are a nation's outward strength: yet the strong arms which raise the iron and make docile the clay, may, if too numerous, pluck down, stone by stone, her most revered institutions, reject the gifts which Providence had in store for her, and abase the crown of her greatness for ever. Each individual man in the community is of more worth than all its material possessions; and at his birth his mother, whether in palace or in cottage, may well have rejoiced with the joy of the first mother: but it is true not the less, when pauperism corrupts the land, that if his brow never bears the brand of Cain, it may wear a stain only less deep—that of a despised man who despises himself; and that to his country he is less than the moss that patches her graves. These are the paradoxes which nature permits, but which man creates. These are the consequences of pauperism. Such is the wisdom of a nation that provides each of its sons with privileges and with facilities for the redress of wrongs, but which takes no thought that each should have breathing room. Such is the wisdom of laws that affect to provide for each pauper a subsistence, but which take no pains to preserve citizens from becoming paupers. Such is the fortune of communities which fulfil the command of 'increase and multiply;' but which forget the rest of the precept, 'replenish the earth and subdue it.'

From this great and growing evil few parts of the United Kingdom are exempt. In England it is not, as in Ireland and

the Highlands of Scotland, a bleeding wound, but a corrupt disease; the treatment of which by mere palliatives, where no cure was attempted, cost the English people in the shape of poor-rate, in the year 1848, about seven millions and a half. The privations of the peasantry in the southern counties are well known. The condition of a people living on the lowest and cheapest species of food, even supposing them to possess in ordinary times a sufficient quantity, is admitted to be precarious; because on any temporary failure of crops they have no margin left for retrenchment: yet it is notorious that, in the use of the potato, as well as in other respects, the labourers of southern England have been gradually approximating to the condition of their Irish fellow-subjects. The highest rate of English wages is to be found in the manufacturing districts; yet even there, upon any fluctuation in business, most severe distress occurs. This circumstance is frequently accounted for by the improvidence of the labouring class, which fails in prosperous times to lay by a provision for the day of adversity: And the allegation is no doubt true in part: But it must be recollected that among the virtues, as among all things, a rule of proportion exists, and that the virtues of frugality and foresight should bear, and will ever bear, a proportionate place only in the national character. Even in those districts, however, and in prosperous times, it is not affirmed that more than a slender surplus could be laid by. And how are these wages earned? Too often by the labour of the whole family, except the infant portion of it. A low standard of life must obtain, equally where earnings are insufficient and where labour is excessive. It is generally thought the mark of a low state of civilisation when women are obliged to go forth in search of employment. That cannot then be a very exalted state in which, not only mothers, whose sphere of duty is at the hearth and by the cradle, but young children, whose place should be at the school or on the playground, are toiling in factories; while the mere infants are cared for by strangers, or lulled with 'God-frey's cordial.' This is a state of things which admits indeed of no sudden cure; it is not, however, the less a duty to bear in mind the existence of evils which, in supplanting the domestic ties, undermine the moral nature. Acclimatised as we are, the chance removal of one of the stones that flag the drain gives us a terrible intimation as to the state of that subterranean world, above which our palaces are built. To these miseries it is not necessary, and it would be very painful, to refer in detail. One instance may suffice. We have heard of 'burial clubs.' These are associations, by entering into which, parents become entitled, on making a small periodic payment, to pecuniary assistance at the burial of a child.

There is somewhat to alarm us in the fact, that one person should subscribe to as many as eighteen or twenty of such clubs: but what are we to think when we hear that, in the cities where they exist, infant mortality is three times as great as in the poorest and most unhealthy parts of the rural districts, and that it proportionately exceeds that of the adjacent towns where those clubs have not yet been established? Some of the socialist philosophers have proposed to adorn the corridors of their communistic parallelograms with flower-vases, in which should be interred, as a consolation for bereft parents, the infants who had perished by 'painless extinction' lest the community should be over-burdened! Do these philosophers lag behind, or only outstrip their age? The tranquillity with which enormities, such as we have alluded to, are discussed by the many, is more ominous than their occurrence. Some find it convenient to doubt them; most to forget. A few would treat them in detail, and treat them empirically. A bill is to be passed one year to prevent women from working among naked men in mines, another year against children toiling in factories at night beyond a certain hour, and a third to discourage infanticide. All exertions are honourable in proportion as they are disinterested and persevering; but it is not too much to say that legislation of this sort hardly goes to the root of the matter. Not seldom it produces effects the reverse of those benevolently intended.

The distressed condition of the poorer classes in Scotland has attracted less attention than that of the English poor, and less than it deserves. Whoever peruses the evidence of Mr. Martin, relative to the island of Skie, given before the Colonization Committee (1st Report, p. 374.), will discover that in the Highlands of Scotland all those evils exist which have commonly been associated with Ireland; — dependence on the potato — the conacre — the cottier system — the subdivision of land — constant distress and occasional starvation, together with their necessary consequences, clearances and evictions.

In Ireland, the distress of the poorer classes, amounting as it often did to famine, was wont of old to resemble rather the destitution found in barbarous tribes than the pauperism of civilised communities; and the domestic virtues at least, if not the social, were spared by it. Under the pressure of the last few years and the influence of out-door relief, those virtues are rapidly disappearing, if any trust is to be reposed in the evidence of inspecting officers, or in the papers laid before Parliament during the last session. In their struggle to emigrate husbands forsake their wives, parents their children, and a system of corruption seems to have set in, comparable only to that which prevailed in the worst pa-



ishes of southern England during the times of the 'allowance system' and the 'labour rate.' It is hardly necessary, after the disclosures made by the Poor-law Committees of both Houses during the last session, to enlarge upon the present economical condition of Ireland. We shall content ourselves with quoting the summary given by the Society of Friends in the 'Final Report' with which they concluded those charitable labours which have done such honour alike to their humanity and their discretion. The Report states:—'The paupers are merely kept alive, either in crowded workhouses, or in alarming numbers depending on out-door relief; their health is not maintained, their physical strength is weakened, their mental capacity is lowered, their moral character degraded: hopeless themselves they offer no hope to their country,—except in the prospect, abhorrent to human nature and Christian feeling, of their gradual extinction by death. Many families are now suffering extreme distress, who, three years since, enjoyed the comforts and refinements of life, and administered to the necessities of those around them. Thus we have seen the flood of pauperism widening more and more, engulfing one class after another, rising higher and higher in its effects on society, until it threatens, in some of the worst districts, to swallow up all ranks and classes within its fatal vortex.'

The statement of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in his letter to the Lord Mayor of London, is not more favourable, and certainly holds out scant hopes of improvement. It concludes thus:—'Such a state of things contains within itself no germ of amelioration; it cannot even remain stationary. It must go on from bad to worse, for the means of improvement are altogether wanting, and the national resources are gradually wasting; and even if the potato were to revive (and to that all classes are clinging with desperate hope), it would only bring back the evils, under which the country has been so long labouring.' From the last report of the Irish Poor-law Commissioners we learn that within a year about fifty thousand persons had died in the workhouses. The mortality in them has frequently amounted, in the more distressed districts, to ten, twelve, and even fourteen out of 1000, *per week*.

Believing that out of the heart of a nation proceed the issues of national life, we have alluded but briefly to evils not directly of a moral sort connected with pauperism. It is time to advance to the remedy. That remedy is to be looked for primarily, we believe, through Colonization. Throughout every department of human life we find that trials, not produced by guilt, are but the painful passage to a better condition; and

that, not the absence, but the right use of suffering, is the object of a wise desire. 'Necessity is the mother of invention;' and every signal advance has been the result of some new pressure acting on the elastic energies of man. It is the gradual urgency of distress that raises hunting tribes to the dignity and security of pastoral life; and it is, among other influences, the same admonition which makes the shepherd's crook yield to the hardier plough and spade, and which, in turn, adds to the resources of agriculture those of commerce and of manufactures. No plausible reason can be assigned for an assumption so gratuitous as that human progress has now found its limit. The particular stage we have at present reached, through the free competition of labourers and of employers, no more bears on its face the impress of being the final condition of our race, than did, at an earlier period, any particular development of feudalism or serfdom. Every day fresh facilities are offered to those who would render available that larger field of employment afforded by the unoccupied portions of the world. This consideration is surely worthy of attention on the part of those who imagine that a reduced rate of increase is by itself the appropriate cure for over-population. Such a remedy, used alone, would check all progress; and perpetuate, perhaps with some abatement in its worst symptoms, a social system far indeed from perfection. It is neither by a constantly equable progress that human society advances, nor by a constant succession of bounds, but by an alternation of ordinary with extraordinary efforts; and the occasional pressure which incites to such unusual exertions is a beneficent part of the system in which we live. In early times the pressure of numbers certainly *was* met by colonization. If we cannot do better than was then done, at least we can do as well.

In the observations which we have to make on this subject, we shall in the first place state our reasons for believing, not indeed that Colonization is in itself a complete remedy for over-population, but that it is an essential part of a remedial process; and that without it no other healing measures can be expected to produce the desired effect. We shall then inquire whether the aid and direction of the State be necessary for such Colonization; and finally we shall specify several modes in which such assistance may be ministered effectually and safely. We are not about to set forth any one 'large and comprehensive scheme.' On the present occasion it will be sufficient to show, that without founding new colonies we have ample means, if we only avail ourselves of our past experience, and of the suggestions repeatedly made by those most conversant with our colonial posses-

sions, to render emigration far more conducive than it has yet proved to the public weal, as well as to the welfare of those engaged in it. The same subject may be spoken of, in popular language, as Emigration when considered with reference to the emigrant, and as Colonization when treated with reference to the new community to be formed. It is obvious, however, that Emigration is not necessarily even a step towards Colonization. It is only when the former is regarded as but the means, and the latter as the end, that we recognise the necessity of making Emigration systematic. Mere emigration might perhaps be left to itself: but if our design be to rear up new communities, we are then urgently reminded of those moral relations with which permanent societies cannot dispense; and for which a provision can be made only by systematic Emigration.

Grievous and extended as are the evils to which we have alluded, it is in Ireland that the pressure of distress is most immediately urgent; and it is natural that our attention should be in the first instance directed to that part of the United Kingdom. With an almost unexampled unanimity, our most influential statesmen and economical writers had repeatedly expressed their conviction, that a large system of emigration was necessary for that country, even before the potato failure. Statements to that effect were made by every committee of the House of Commons, with but one unimportant exception, which had deliberated on the social condition of Ireland, since the year 1822: and the necessity for assisted emigration was yet more strongly felt when an Irish poor-law was projected. In the year 1831 the present Lord Grey accordingly stated, that before any measure could be effectually introduced for the permanent relief of Irish destitution, that country must be relieved from its superabundant population. Mr. Nicholls, in his various reports, insisted strongly on the absolute necessity of emigration, considered with reference to the working of a poor-law in Ireland; and the same opinion was expressed by the commissioners successively appointed to inquire into the subject of Poor-laws; in one of whose reports, signed by the Archbishop of Dublin, it was expressly recommended that relief should be given to the able-bodied through emigration alone. During a quarter of a century, in short, all parties consulted have concurred in the conviction, that without an organised emigration the most guarded poor-law could not in Ireland have even a fair trial. As to the grounds of their opinion, no long inquiry is needed: facts speak for themselves. We shall notice but a few of those insisted on by witnesses examined before the recent Committee of the House of Commons on the Irish Poor-law.

Referring to the rural statistics of the two countries, we find that, previous to the late famine, the agricultural labourers of Ireland stood to those of England in the proportion of 5 to 2, when compared with reference to the extent of land in cultivation: while, so far from this being accounted for by a corresponding surplus of produce in Ireland, the Irish labourers stood to the English in the ratio of even 4 to 1, when compared with reference to the produce raised. The agricultural labourers of England were estimated, in 1831, to be 1,055,982, those of Ireland to be 1,131,715; at which time the agricultural produce of England was valued at 150,000,000*l.*, and that of Ireland at 36,000,000*l.* per annum. This fact is in itself sufficient to account for the low rate of wages in Ireland: little as the labourer received, that little bore at least as large a proportion as in England to the produce raised by his labour. The Irish agricultural labourer found employment for hire, on an average, during only 135 days in the year, living in the *interim*, partly on his scanty earnings, and partly on his small holding, or on what has gained an unenviable notoriety under the name of *con-acre*. Taking into account the time that he laboured for himself, his employment did not last for more than 166 days in the year, and his earnings did not exceed an average of 2*s.* 3*d.* per week. With such an annual rate of wages it was impossible that his physical condition should be otherwise than miserable: But, far from such misery having had a tendency to work its own cure, population advanced most recklessly wherever the standard of living was lowest, and the class of habitation was the meanest. While within the years 1831 and 1841 the increase of numbers was in Ulster 14 per cent., and in Leinster 9 per cent., in Munster it was 15 per cent., and in Connaught 21 per cent.

In such a state of things it was obvious that the first great failure of produce, if continued for any considerable time, must break up both the social and the agricultural system of Ireland, and must do so; not by degrees, but accompanied by the calamities which attend convulsive change. The great evil of an agriculture based on the potato was, that partly from its extraordinary productiveness, partly from the social relations produced by such a system, it superseded, to a large extent, the primal law of labour,—as the cultivation of the bread-fruit tree on a large scale would yet more fatally do,—and established no proportion between numbers and employment. It is computed that there were two millions of acres under the potato culture; and on the ordinary calculation that it requires three acres even of oats to produce as much human food as one acre of potatoes, a new creation of land to the amount of four millions of acres,

would have been necessary, in order to support on cereal food the population previously maintained on potatoes. But such a creation being impossible, there remains only one alternative,—either the removal of the unemployed population to regions in which food is abundant and a large demand for labour exists, or else the introduction of a greatly improved system of agriculture. The latter is the course which we should prefer if, as has been too often assumed, with a calamitous rashness, the two were really separate and independent courses: but it seems impossible, on mature reflection, to deny that for a sound system of agriculture, the very first requisite must be the withdrawal from the country of those who cannot find employment there, and who hang like a dead weight on the industry of others. It is true that high farming can maintain a large labouring population; but high farming requires not only that high scientific knowledge which is of slow growth, but also a large expenditure of capital. It is the possession of great skill, habitual energy, and vast capital, which alone renders possible such a system of farming, horticultural rather than agricultural, as has grown up in Belgium, in the midst of abundant markets, wealthy towns, and flourishing manufactures; a system the origin and growth of which has been favoured by every circumstance that can promote industry and protect its fruits. The Irish farmer has not, like the Belgian, capital to the amount of 15*l.* per acre to invest in his land; and the Irish pauper is the great obstacle to the introduction of additional capital. Let us, then, consider for a moment what we actually mean when we speak of the improvement of Irish agriculture.

The first condition of improvement is universally admitted to be such an enlargement of the holdings as will permit of a right rotation of crops. According to the return of the Poor-law Commissioners, the number of holdings in Ireland *under five acres*, amounted, before the famine, to 317,264; being more than one third of the total number existing; while those under ten acres included more than half the number in the land. Now the occupiers of these small holdings were deprived by the failure of the potato, not only of their usual food, but also of the pig, and of that manure, in the absence of which the cultivation of corn is impossible. Without assuming, then, that it would be practicable in Ireland to adopt the English system of large farms, it is obvious that if their cultivator is to pay rent or rates, or even to live, these very small holdings must be consolidated. Such is the assertion of Mr. Blacker, a gentleman well known both for his acquaintance with agriculture, and for his vindication, till the potato failure, of the small farm system.

When examined before the Colonization Committee he observed: — ‘It is a physical impossibility to grow so much grain upon a five or six acre farm as will support a family consisting of six to seven persons. It would be necessary to sow part of the land with a grain crop twice in succession, which cannot be carried on; it could not be continued for any course of seasons.’ To the same effect is the evidence of Mr. Kincaid, who states that no farm ought to be less than 20*l.* in its annual valuation. What is then to become of those who can no longer cultivate their small tenements? They must fall, it is said, into the condition of labourers. But the labour market is already and independently of them, greatly overstocked. They are accordingly falling every day into the class of paupers, dragging down by the weight of poor-rates the farmers one grade above the position which *they* recently occupied, and thus condemning the land to barrenness, instead of leaving room for its improved cultivation. How rapidly this process is going on will be seen by a reference to Captain Larcom’s agricultural returns for 1848. The difficulty is thus met by Count Strzelecki, a man whose name, known in many lands, can nowhere deserve to be more reverently or gratefully remembered than in Ireland: — ‘I think that the transfer of land from insolvent proprietors to capitalists should be combined with another measure, to enable unions to cope with a system of emigration, where such emigration is absolutely necessary; and if the relation is maintained which now subsists between numbers and land, it will be impossible to raise upon that land grain food sufficient to provide for the population.’ (8590, 8591.)

Nor is it the cottier farmer of Ireland alone whose position has undergone such a total revolution: the occupiers of well-sized farms are exposed to difficulties hardly less serious, in consequence of the new-born necessity of paying in money wages for that labour which had previously been remunerated chiefly by the con-acre. Money wages, it must be remembered, were in Ireland comparatively unknown; the potato constituted the agricultural currency of the country; and the bank which supplied that circulating medium having failed, the means of paying wages are intercepted, at the moment that a large additional employment of labour is necessary. To advance from the truck system to a system of money wages, and to advance from a lower to a higher species of food, are both of them important achievements in the progress of civilisation; but, if to take either of these steps is an arduous enterprise, to take both of them at once, and that too at a period of great agricultural depression, is a plain impossibility. An additional obstacle is

thus opposed, also, to the reclamation of waste lands; such improvements having formerly been promoted mainly by the potato crop, so abundantly yielded on land newly broken up. Now these difficulties cannot be met by native resources alone, whatever may be the aspirations of a certain party in Ireland styling itself exclusively national. Even if that party were to succeed in effecting what they, perhaps, consider the solution of the Irish problem,—if they could elicit the latent energies of the Irish farmer by abolishing rents, and by giving him a permanent and absolute interest in the soil,—it is still certain that, without an influx of British capital, the resources of that soil could not be developed; and that, with a retrograde agriculture, the new class of farmer-proprietors could only be saved from ruin by an enormous mortality among the paupers who would otherwise divide with them a produce yearly diminishing.

The real question then is, under what circumstances is fresh capital likely to be invested in Ireland? If any proportion exist between numbers and employment, and again between employment and capital, the most sanguine can hardly hope that a much larger number of rural labourers can permanently find employment in Ireland, than find it at present in England. But it is not only when compared with *English* statistics that the disproportion appears between numbers and the means of employment in Ireland. In France, the number of the population is 39 to the hundred cultivated acres, in Scotland it is 51; in Ireland, at the last returns, it was 60. In England and Wales it is only 53, including the multitudes who derive their support from commerce,—the distribution of that population being as follows: In Great Britain, the agricultural population is 22 per cent. of the whole; the commercial 46; and the miscellaneous 32 per cent. In Ireland, the agricultural population is 64 per cent., the commercial 18 per cent., and the miscellaneous 18 per cent. If we compare the population of the two countries irrespectively, as far as may be, of manufacturing employment, we find that in Westmoreland the number per cent. of the population engaged in agricultural pursuits is 27, in Lincolnshire it is 40; in Kerry, one of the poorest parts of Ireland, it is 77.

While these proportions are allowed to remain, what prospects lie before the English capitalist disposed to invest money in Irish land? The prospect of paying poor-rate to an extent that defies calculation,—and, perhaps in his turn, of receiving it. On this subject a few figures have a large significance. The Poor-law statistics of the two countries, compared together, are such as might have been expected from

their respective proportions of numbers and employment. In Dorsetshire, the poverty of which has attracted much attention of late, the rateable value of property is 735,224*l.*, the population being but 174,743. The valuation of Ireland at the introduction of the Poor-law was a little above 13,000,000*l.*, and the population a little more than 8,000,000; nor is there any reason to suppose that numbers have since diminished more than the value of property. The disproportion would be far more striking, were we to refer to Connaught especially, or to such extreme, yet hardly exceptional cases, as the unions of Glenties, Westport, Ballina, Scariff, and many others. The agricultural returns for the last year have not yet been made up; but we greatly fear that when produced, they will exhibit a state of things even more unsatisfactory than might be inferred from the statistics which we have had at our command.

These views derive an additional confirmation from the ordinary arguments brought against emigration, in which, after a careful examination, we can see little force. The present crisis in Ireland, it is said by some, is but a temporary calamity; and when it passes away, the obstacles which it opposes to the investment of capital will have passed away also. Was capital then, we reply, freely invested in Ireland before the potato failure? Ireland would long since have prospered had it not been for the fact that, year after year, that boundless and ever increasing capital which visits the remotest regions of the world, has been repulsed from her shores. The British capital which within a very few years has been spent on railways alone, or is pledged to them, not to refer to bubble speculations abroad, would have sufficed to buy up the whole landed property of Ireland! Yet, in most parts of that country, we find much excellent land in a comparatively unproductive state, while its improvement would pay a large percentage on the capital expended. Why then did Ireland alone repel British capital and enterprise? Of all the causes which can be assigned, the most stringent undoubtedly was that lawlessness, those agrarian outrages—those illegal combinations—in a word, that insecurity of property which the pressure of over-population maintained and exasperated. If the work of fifty men was, by a silent convention, to be extended for the benefit of a hundred—if the farmer was not allowed to cultivate such crops as he pleased, because his neighbours wanted con-acre—and if a proprietor could not manage his farms so as to admit of their due cultivation without the murder of his agent or bailiff—capital, of course, could not be invested in many parts of Ireland. And yet such a system of terrorism was the necessary result of a state, in



which there were always two competitors for a prize insufficient for one. Had it been possible to introduce capital largely into Ireland before the potato failure, the first object to which it must have been devoted, in order to make room for other enterprises, would have been the removal of the superfluous population. Such speculations are, however, rendered needless by that renewed failure of the potato, which, in spite of too sanguine prognostications and some premature triumph, has recently taken place. The experiment of a potato culture, though once more recklessly tried on a scale deplored by all intelligent persons, has been unsuccessful: nor will the potato henceforth be relied on; except by such as are indifferent to the results of their own exertions, because they have, at the worst, out-door relief in reserve. It is not a little instructive, that those who deem systematic emigration unnecessary for Ireland, should be reduced to support their theory by a supposed restoration of its former state. The hopes of Ireland, on the contrary, as has been frequently observed (among others by several members of the present government), are based on the hypothesis that the calamities through which it has passed, will at least subvert an agricultural and social state which condemned the labouring poor to a condition as mean as was consistent with existence, and the higher class to one of perpetual warfare, offensive or defensive. That unhappy country, it is indeed obvious, must go forward, not back. Providence does not send such lessons in vain; and, from so terrible an experience, this one at least will be learned.

Before quitting the subject of Ireland, it may be well to notice one or two other objections, not at all more plausible than the last, which are sometimes brought against assisted emigration. The work, it is said, is already done, and the pressure effectually relieved by the enormous emigration of the last three years. In that case, we may ask, what is the apology for those extravagant rates of which we hear so much? The persons holding land rated under 10*l.* per annum, including their families, were probably at least two millions. How many of these can now support themselves? And, in addition to them, there are multitudes now utterly destitute, who formerly lived by their labour and by con-acre. Unable to pay money wages, the farmers, as the documents connected with Ireland inform us, have been diminishing their number of servants, and working their farms with their own hands. Are we to suppose that all those left destitute have been provided for by the voluntary emigration of the last three years? This emigration has, indeed, been very large; but if there were no other

proof of its insufficiency, we should have a conclusive one in its character. The change in that character has been one of the most striking signs of the times; and, if we can trust the documents laid before us, what is called emigration has been, to a very large extent, a flight of farmers,—that is, an emigration of capital. The papers relative to the destitute unions in the West, produced to Parliament, abound in lamentable accounts of vast districts left waste by the flight of farmers. To the same effect is the evidence of nearly all the witnesses examined before the Poor-law Committees of both Houses. ‘In the county of Mayo,’ says Mr. Brett, ‘upon immense tracts there is not any stock, or any single thing in the world, that could be rendered available for the payment of rates. There has been an abandonment of not less than 50,000 acres heretofore in cultivation, with an enormous extent of mountain country.’ More recently it has been stated, and we fear, too correctly, that the quantity of land left waste in Mayo alone, by this time, exceeds 100,000 acres. Ample information on this subject will be found in the evidence of Messrs. Otway, Kincaid, Bourke, Farren, Bewley, Senior, Colonel Knox Gore, Colonel Clarke, and others. Mr. Murdoch, chairman of the Emigration Board, mentions, as an illustration of last year’s emigration, that ‘on board the “Ocean Monarch,” which was destroyed by fire at Liverpool, it was ascertained that 320 emigrants possessed among them 10,000*l*.’ What is it that drives away those small capitalists? The excessive rates necessary for the support of paupers who have not been assisted to emigrate, and who, because they are paupers, cannot assist themselves. Whether, then, the question relate to the introduction of fresh capital, or to the retention of that which exists, the difficulty is the same. If the existing paupers are not enabled to emigrate, those, who do not choose to become paupers in their turn, must emigrate in their stead. Capital cannot long maintain an unequal struggle; and want and misery will, by a fatal victory, drive from the country those by whom alone its wounds could be healed. The only alternative is that which Mr. Hamilton of St. Ernans had the sagacity to appreciate; and of which he had also, fortunately, the means to avail himself.

‘Two or three years ago a great many of my tenantry of the better class, thought of emigrating. When I saw this, I immediately, with a great deal of difficulty, the times being bad, raised a large sum of money, and sent out about a seventh part of the whole population; and the result has been, that not a single one of the wealthy tenants moved. . . . I considered it better *that the poorer class should be*

*removed at my cost, than that the better class should remove at their own cost.' (4594-5.)*

The emigration thus carried out by Mr. Hamilton was effectual in its character, and moderate in its amount,—because it was undertaken in time: and this consideration leads us to another and most important branch of the subject. Let it never be forgotten that a due reduction of numbers, in time, is the only means by which we can guard against a needlessly large, and yet, it may be, an unavailing reduction at a later period. That reduction may indeed take place without emigration. In many parts of Ireland the population has *died off through the diseases connected with famine*, till the particular reduction has far exceeded what would have been sufficient had it been made by timely emigration; and yet, even in those parts, population is still relatively redundant. Rapidly as it has diminished, property has been destroyed and capital driven away yet more rapidly. The most reduced population will still be too numerous to be supported on a waste—a waste perpetuated by such accumulated arrears of poor-rate as render its profitable cultivation impracticable. This evil not only daily aggravates itself, but at last becomes incapable of cure. In parts of Mayo, as we are informed by Mr. Bourke, one of the Poor-law inspectors of Connaught, so wasted are the people by want and disease, that an able-bodied man is hardly to be seen. In a state of physical decay and mental despondency, they are of course incapable of prospering as emigrants; and no one would wish to cast them on a foreign shore only to perish. These unhappy beings are objects for hospital relief, if it be not too late even for that. If, in spite of the large promise of an extended Poor-law, they, like multitudes who have preceded them, must die, they have a right at least to die at home. Nor is it in Connaught only that such cases are found. And yet the depopulation of these districts is by some persons adduced as a reason for not assisting other parts of the country, which, without aid, must in no long time share their fate. ‘Some parts of Ireland,’ they urge, ‘are already half depopulated: in some parts the distressed poor are unfit for emigration; therefore leave emigration to itself. Mayo (which was let alone) is past cure: therefore let us do nothing for Kerry.’ It is not easy to see the force of this argument.

We are sorry to observe that Mr. Bright is among those who have allowed themselves to be caught by what we cannot but regard as a very patent fallacy. He objects to the remedy of emigration, however, not merely because he found districts in Ireland to which it is, as every one admits, inapplicable, but because he has a remedy of his own. Remove all feudal traditions in the

way of entail, was his advice, in a speech made after a short tour in Ireland — with all legal procrastination, all that net-work of vexatious obstacles, by which the day of sale is kept at a distance: estates will then change hands like any chattels, and capital will employ labour. Travellers may be expected occasionally to take a somewhat 'bird's-eye view' of subjects, which would be better understood if looked at a little more in detail; and though he who runs may read, he sometimes gets to the end of the page sooner than to the bottom of the matter. There already exists in Ireland a law—that for the sale of encumbered estates—which neglects no means to facilitate the transference of property, except that of compelling people to buy. If assisted emigration be adopted, and the devastations of the outdoor relief system abated, Mr. Bright may probably see — what he cannot more ardently desire than we do — the sale of such portions of encumbered estates as would free the rest from debt, and the development of Ireland's agricultural resources, by means of an industrial conquest unstained by force or fraud. But if the present policy be persisted in, it seems not unlikely that two men may disappear for every one who was originally superfluous, and yet that the population may continue as excessive, relatively to the means of subsistence, as it is now. Agriculture would in this event recede more rapidly than population; and a famine of the thirteenth century be super-added to one of the nineteenth.

The capacity of the Irishman to make a successful emigrant has been by some denied. On this subject, however, the direct testimony which we possess is stronger than either theory or prejudice. We need only refer our readers to that so conclusively given, and with such remarkable unanimity, by witnesses from all our colonies, examined by the recent Colonization Committee. The efficiency and success of the Irish emigrant in Canada is attested by Mr. Pemberton and Mr. Brydone; in New Brunswick by Mr. Perley; in Nova Scotia by Mr. Uniake; in the United States by Mr. Minturn; in Australia and Van Diemen's Land by Colonel Mitchell, Colonel Macarthur, Mr. Verner, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Besnard, Mr. Justice Therry, and the Rev. C. D. Lang. A yet more recent witness is Count Strzelecki, who observes, in his evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords on the Irish Poor-law: —

'The Irishman improves in two or three years by emigrating to Australia: he acquires habits of industry; he learns to rely upon himself more than he does in Ireland; he has an openness in his character, and shows all that he can do, while here he does not show it.' . . . 'I would say that he is adapted for every thing; if he only

knows and sees his own interest, and understands and sees his way through, he adapts himself to every circumstance in which he is placed.' . . . 'I saw Irishmen in the United States, in Canada, and in Australia, living as well as the Anglo-Saxons, acquiring their grumbling habits, and thus improving continually their condition.' . . . 'This difference may perhaps be more successfully traced to the consequences of the transplantation from a narrow and confined moral and physical sphere of action, to a larger space with more freedom and more cheerful prospects of life, and of which they have none at home.'

It may be worth while to take notice of another and a very whimsical objection frequently brought against colonization,—one which applies to it equally, whether considered with reference to England or Ireland. Colonization, it is said, tends to reproduce those evils which it endeavours to relieve, because the additional space it affords promotes marriages. This is an argument to prove that nothing human is final, and that every advantage, if abused, may produce its own opposite. Virtue unquestionably conduces to prosperity; and prosperity is among the snares by which virtue is sometimes subverted; but this circumstance is not commonly deemed an argument against honest dealing. Good diet, in like manner, tends to maintain health, and consequently to renew appetite; but except in the instance of Swift's admonition to his servant, this fact has never been urged as a reason for not eating one's breakfast. In proportion as colonization ceased to afford relief, it would cease to encourage population: at worst, therefore, it could not aggravate pauperism though it allowed an increase to numbers. If there is anything indeed in the argument, it is plain that the objection applies equally to the acquisition of new markets, to improvements in machinery, and to progress in agriculture, since these also may stimulate population. There is, however, one important difference in the supposed stimulants. The relief afforded in the last three cases is temporary in its nature, while to that which may be afforded by colonization it would be difficult to assign a limit. It should also be observed that the objection in reality applies only to colonization carried on as a constant but always imperfect work, as it actually is at present by the unassisted efforts of individuals; and would have no reference to a colonization undertaken by the State at periods of special need, and so completely effected as to raise the standard of life at home. That standard once raised, will not soon fall again, if a sound system of moral education,—without which all reforms must prove vain,—confirm and improve the advantage thus gained. The imprudent marriages produced by the recklessness of poverty

will be checked; and that room should thus incidentally be made for an increase of prudent marriages, need hardly be a subject of complaint.

Whether colonization be or be not among the remedial measures which Ireland needs, one thing is certain, namely, that the remedies hitherto tried—relied on for long they cannot be said to have been by any party—have proved mischievous or wholly inadequate. The large expenditure under the Labour Rate Act in the year 1846-7, and under the Temporary Relief Act, (a far more effectual and less costly measure,) sufficiently attested the willingness of Parliament to make whatever efforts the exigency required; but although it to a very great extent averted mortality at the time, yet, including no remedy that has been found to strike at the root of the disease, it necessarily left things as they were; bequeathing only the burden of a peasantry demoralised by pauper labour, together with an additional debt upon property suddenly reduced in value.

During the last few years a prolonged famine has been met by an extended Poor-law, including a large system of out-door relief, and propped in some cases by charitable funds from the British Association and from the State. That system too, it may safely be said, has given satisfaction to no one—not even to the officers who administered it, or to the paupers who received relief. In the first place, it is obvious that the charitable contributions last named, when not so applied as to remove the causes of distress, as well as to mitigate its symptoms, cannot but have a tendency to reproduce those causes,—a fact which has been loudly proclaimed by many voices both from England and Ireland. In the second place, the Poor-law itself, whatever its operation might have been in ordinary times (a matter not now in question), has assuredly proved itself incapable of dealing single-handed with a famine. It has had, on a large scale, the same effect which a constant succession of grants from England would have produced;—it has supported, or rather promised to support, the pauperised part of every electoral division, by subsidies raised, without limitation, from those parts in which industry had bequeathed prosperity or earned an independence. It has fed, in short, *the Ireland upon the England* of every union and every townland. Dispensing also with the ordinary tests of destitution, and in many places discarding that local agency notoriously requisite for the protection of property, it has added, by countless administrative corruptions, to the pressure of pauperism; thus threatening the confiscation not only of rent but of the farmer's capital! and of the ordinary labour fund; and proportionately diminishing production, by way of compensating for a failure of

produce. External funds, such as we have alluded to, whether supplied by the charity of individuals, by that of the State, or by a '*rate in aid*,' when used but to prop a poor-law, will mitigate none of these evils; because they can of course only be applied *after* all local resources have been exhausted,—that is to say, after the land has been stripped bare of the resources and appliances necessary for its continued cultivation. The Irish Poor-law, however, is a question which we need not here discuss. In the Report made by the Committee of the House of Lords appointed during the last session to investigate the subject, a strong opinion is expressed against the allowance of out-door relief, except to the old and impotent for whom room cannot be found in the workhouse. But so conscious was that Committee of the necessity of providing, in some other way, for those who now subsist on such relief, that we are not surprised at finding the following passage at the close of its Report:—'With this conviction impressed on their minds, the Committee earnestly recommend that measures be taken for aiding and promoting the *Emigration* of those classes, on some organised system, which shall enable such as are willing to leave Ireland and are qualified to earn a livelihood in other countries, to remove thither cheaply and safely.' Five cabinet ministers we believe sat on the committee which did not hesitate to pledge itself to these opinions. Should such convictions be carried out in legislation, we shall again have hopes for Ireland.

There are still persons, strange as it may seem, who imagine that Ireland cannot suffer from an excess of population, because she possesses 'industrial resources.' We would entreat such persons to remember that the far-famed industrial resources of Ireland cannot be hers, while she is unable to employ the labour necessary for their development. So long as pauperism, and its attendant lawlessness, scare away capital or dissipate it, her attempts to appropriate those resources will be like the attempt of the fox in the fable to drink out of a bottle, or that of the stork to feed from a platter. Let us consider the case of an Irish proprietor in a pauperised district, who, probably by means of a loan from the State, employs an extraordinary number of men on some industrial enterprise. Let us suppose even that he receives fair labour,—a circumstance not likely to occur while the people know that if he withdraws their employment he must support them by rates. But even on this supposition, what will be the ultimate effect of his experiment? Unless he has been able to assist emigration while the work was in progress, he will discover when it is over, that it has acted as an artificial stimulus to population, attracting new comers to the neighbourhood, and discouraging

prudential habits. The work too must soon come to an end ; but the population will remain. We are, therefore, little surprised to hear, that while in the sounder parts of Ireland such loans have been eagerly sought, in the more distressed parts many persons who had applied for them hesitate to draw the money to which they are entitled. Compare with this effort at extinguishing the flame by pouring oil on it, or at crossing the sea by the aid of one or two stepping-stones, the rare case of those districts in which proprietors, more wise or more wealthy than their neighbours, have brought society to a natural condition by assisting the unemployed poor to emigrate. Whoever refers to the evidence given in the recent Colonization and Poor-law Committees respecting the estates of Lord Palmerston, Sir Robert Gore Booth, and Mr. Spaight, will find that these gentlemen, beginning their reform at the right end, have laid a foundation for the restoration of society and order, where there had previously existed nothing but confusion, pauperism, and despair. Even her Majesty's too celebrated estate of Ballykilcline has at last ceased to be a burden. It has been sold, having been first made saleable by the emigration we believe of every individual living on it, with the exception of a single family ! Had emigration been resorted to in time, it will not be denied that several benefits, not altogether insignificant, would have followed — that a better price would have been received for the land — that a larger proportion of promised rent would have been paid during the last few years — that great legal expenses and much individual suffering would have been spared — that the process of demoralisation would have been arrested — and that a less wholesale clearance would have sufficed. Ballykilcline is a small place : but the principles tested there, are applicable on a large scale, and in regions in which no proportionate local resources are now to be found. In unions which require a rate in aid, in order to keep starvation at arm's length from day to day, and in unions where 30 per cent. above the market price is paid to contractors, because funds cannot be raised to discharge old debts, it is little likely that local resources or local credit can exist for the assistance of emigrants. In such districts the poor are not much the better for a recent enactment, empowering guardians to spend upon their emigration a sum not exceeding 2s. 6d. in the pound. That enactment, however, at least recognises the necessity of emigration.

Among many who admit the importance of emigration, it is frequently made a question whether such an enterprise ought to be undertaken or assisted by the State. That question we have no hesitation in answering affirmatively ; on the several



grounds of justice, of humanity, and of expediency. This, we know, was the opinion of Mr. Malthus. It has been strongly expressed by Mr. Mill in the following passage of his recent work on the 'Principles of Political Economy,' vol. ii. pp. 540—542.

'There need be no hesitation in affirming that colonization, in the present state of the world, is the very best affair of business, in which the capital of an old and wealthy country can possibly engage.'

'It is equally obvious, however, that colonization on a great scale, can be undertaken as an affair of business, only by the Government, or by some combination of individuals in complete understanding with the Government. Emigration on the voluntary principle cannot have any material influence in lightening the pressure of population in the old country, though, as far as it goes, it is doubtless a benefit to the colony. Those labouring persons who voluntarily emigrate are seldom the very poor; they are small farmers with some little capital, or labourers who have saved something, and who in removing only their own labour from the crowded labour market, withdraw from the capital of the country a fund which maintained and employed more labourers than themselves. . . . Any considerable emigration of labour is only practicable, when its cost is defrayed, or at least advanced, by others than the labourers themselves.'

Mr. Mill's observation respecting the large drain from the capital of the home country made by unassisted emigration, has been emphatically confirmed by the Irish emigration of the last year, already referred to. When we consider that in all countries, over-population is a relative term, meaning only that numbers are excessive as compared with the capital available for their employment, we perceive at once that to diminish capital must produce exactly the same effect as to increase numbers; — that in fact it but transfers the *plus* quantity with a *minus* sign, from one side of the equation to the other, and changes the same logical proposition from a positive to a negative form. We can therefore estimate the force of a common objection to assisted emigration, the drift of which is, that unemployed labourers require no assistance to emigrate, because employers who wish for a return for their capital escape to foreign countries without aid. A man who has saved money enough, not only to emigrate, but to emigrate without leaving his family a charge on the public, is not one of that class which is either most a burden at home, or of most service in our colonies, where the capitalists are at the mercy of the labourers.

Another reason why colonization should be a national undertaking is also stated by Mr. Mill, and cannot be better given than in his words.

'One of the principal reasons why colonization should be a National undertaking is, that in this manner alone can emigration be self-supporting. The exportation of capital and labour to a new country being, as has been observed, one of the best of all affairs of business, it is absurd that it should not, like other affairs of business, repay its own expenses. Of the great addition which it makes to the produce of the world, there can be no reason why a sufficient portion should not be intercepted, and employed in reimbursing the outlay incurred in effecting it. For reasons already given, no individual, or body of individuals, can reimburse themselves for the expense; the Government, however, can. It can take from the annual increase of wealth, caused by the emigration, the fraction which suffices to repay with interest what the emigration has cost. The expenses of emigration to a colony ought to be borne by the colony; and this, in general, is only possible when they are borne by the Colonial Government.' (Vol. ii. p. 542.)

Against the last sentence only of this statement are we inclined to take exception. It is true that colonies are so greatly benefited by an adequate supply of labourers, that they are frequently, as in the instance of Australia, not indisposed to pay the cost of their passage. The home country, however, gains by it also; and in that country there are classes so especially benefited,—proprietors and rate-payers, we mean,—that it would be no hardship to demand a special contribution from them. They are themselves suffering; not only indirectly but directly also, from the general pressure on society. Professions are confessedly overstocked. The difficulty of earning a subsistence by trade increases each year. Every day it becomes more common for young men of good families to speak of marriage as a lot forbidden them; while young women of the best character and education find themselves debarred, if reduced in circumstances, from any sphere in which they can decently provide for the most humble wants. It is well known that among the railway attendants are not a few, who have known better days—officers who cannot support a family on half-pay, lawyers without a brief, and physicians without a fee. Why then in the ranks of our emigrants have there been hitherto comparatively so few belonging to the middle or the higher classes? Partly because, owing to the deficient supply of labour and the consequently high rate of wages in the colonies, the investment of capital becomes a dangerous speculation there; and partly because they cannot find there a befitting education for their children, the social comforts they are used to, or that political independence which, however desirable, cannot of course often be entrusted to a scattered and ignorant population. But a remedy for those evils would be found at once in such State assist-

ance to colonization, as not only imparted to the emigrant the benefit of his country's laws, and made a provision for religion and education, but gave him also comparatively cheap labour. It is not merely on economical grounds that a rate of wages so exorbitant as nearly to swallow up the profits of capital is to be deprecated. The whole intertexture of society is thus torn asunder, and, with the mutual dependence of class on class, the principle of co-operation is made a nullity. In such a state of things there are no means of resisting that *centrifugal* force which disperses the new settlers, and tends to people our colonies with barbarous hordes in place of civilised communities, — rendering impossible, not only rent, but all gradations of rank, as well as that wealth, that leisure, and that knowledge, in the absence of which we shall look in vain for the arts of civilisation. If then various classes of society are deeply interested in colonization, and especially the class of proprietors, they are bound, in justice as in expediency, to share its cost. Can any man now call to mind the advantages which England derives from the United States without deploring those sufferings with which the first settlers had to contend, — sufferings by which so large a number were cut off, and so many efforts rendered abortive?

Let us regard the matter simply in a financial point of view. The following Table states the numbers who inhabited our colonies in the years 1842 and 1847, as well as the colonial exports and imports during those years: —

Colonies.	Population.		Imports into U. K. Official Value.		Declared Value of Exports from U. K.	
	1842.	1847.	1842.	1847.	1842.	1847.
			£	£	£	£
N. America -	1,621,000	1,993,000	1,391,000	2,188,000	2,280,000	3,490,000
W. Indies -	901,000	926,000	6,015,000	6,428,000	2,591,000	2,789,000
Other Colonies	2,152,000	2,570,000	3,087,000	13,077,000	3,198,000	9,984,000
Total - -	4,674,000	5,490,000	10,495,000	21,694,000	8,070,000	16,263,000

NOTE. — The totals include broken sums omitted in the detached account.

For how large a portion of British industry then are we not indebted to the colonial demand for British manufactures, the progressive increase of which is marked by the above table? The population of Europe consumes British manufactures to the value of two shillings a head: the population of our colonies consumes them to the value of 7*l.* and 8*l.* Another table will show this:—

Imports and Exports.		Imports per Head.			Exports per Head.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
New South Wales	Sydney District -	6	13	1½	7	17	0
	Port Philip District -	6	4	11	10	8	5
South Australia - - -		8	5	1	6	13	6
Total Australian Colonies -		7	5	10	7	14	3

We may see, then, to what extent Colonization is likely to benefit our trade, if we take into account the descendants of the first colonists: And on this subject we have one great fact to guide our judgment. The United States of America are British colonies—in a mature state: And to them and to our more recent colonies we are indebted for about *one third* of our whole export trade. To this we are to add the corresponding benefit derived from imports. What would have been the condition of the Irish population during the recent years of famine, if the oldest of our colonies had not sent back to the parent country a food which supports human life at the cost of less than a penny a day? To colonize, it should always be remembered, is truly to send human labour to those unexhausted regions which yield that labour the largest return; and to raise every object of which we have need in the most congenial climate and soil. In proportion as commodities are imported at a lower price, a given rate of wages will maintain at home a larger population: in proportion as new markets are opened for our manufactures, the rate of wages earned by that larger population will tend to rise; while an increased business will, at the same time, add to the profits of the employer and the shipowner. The Yorkshire manufacturer is indebted to the Australian shepherd at once for a customer and for cheap wool. Reflecting on these things, we cannot applaud the wisdom of that ‘laissez faire’ system, which compelled 900,000 Australian sheep to be boiled down into tallow for want of shepherds, at the very time that in Ireland nearly as large a number of men were reduced to the condition of paupers for want of an effective demand for labour. A system which converts paupers into consumers, and outlaws at heart into the pioneers of civilisation, is surely not less precious than that economy of nature which changes the refuse of our streets into manure, and raises up life out of death. Nor can the providence of a state ever be more worthily applied than in directing such energies.

It is not merely from the enlargement of her trade that a nation gains by colonization, but by its *increased security* likewise. The fluctuations of trade, whether produced by geogra-

phical discoveries, scientific improvements, hostile tariffs, or political changes, are proverbial; and we are reminded by the Italian cities, as well as by many an instance in ancient history, of the inconstancy of commercial fortune. We know not yet how railroads (that especially which so soon must join the Atlantic and the Pacific), or the other inventions which time hourly brings forth, may affect existing trade; but we do know that in proportion as we breed up new communities in other parts of the world, we become less dependent on European markets. Neither should we forget that colonization must ere long become a European question; and that in it, as in every other 'affair of business,' we must encounter European competition. Of this we have a foretaste in that German emigration which already meets British emigrants in North America, Australia, and the Cape of Good Hope. When every country in the old world is full, the alternative will be, colonization or convulsion; and nations which are now content to leave fertile coasts to be tenanted only by sea-birds or a few scattered savages, will contend with us eagerly for the first title to a waste.

On the grounds of humanity and of sound morals, even more than on economical grounds, it would seem that colonization, assuredly one of the most arduous as well as noblest national acts, ought not to be left to the cupidity of adventurers, or the unassisted efforts of fugitive paupers. The first emigrants are commonly those, whom the pressure of distress has forced from their places in society. Unassisted, or assisted only by casual charity, they must go forth alone. The severance of that tie which binds a man to his country is in itself a severe trial; and far indeed must the decay of national feeling have gone before it is thought of as a light matter. That loss, therefore, should not involve a further disruption of those still nearer bonds which even barbarous races, in their migrations, maintain inviolate. Our emigrants should, for the most part, consist of small families, not of isolated individuals. If domestic relations were needful on no other account, they would be necessary to balance the peculiar temptations to which colonial life is exposed, — lawlessness, selfishness, and a practical materialism. Such evils, we may rely on it, are more easily prevented than cured. There are persons, we are aware, who discuss these matters as though they believed that the body of a new society is first to be created; and that a soul need not be infused into it till leisure can be found for the enjoyment of luxuries. But the latter part of this process is not an easy one. Habits, once established, are not soon supplanted; and in the progress of society spiritual aspirations and generous affections are more apt to evaporate, than to accumulate with other wealth, in the rustic's barn or the merchant's store. It

is in the human sympathies alone that a foundation can be laid for the moral virtues, or even for the preservation of peace and a reverence for law. Mr. Elliot, a high authority, observes, that what he happily calls a 'domestic police,' is conducive even to the worldly prosperity of a colony; and says, with reference to the emigration of families, 'If there really are able-bodied persons capable of providing for all, I think that it would be inhuman in them to leave behind them any aged members of their family who may have been accustomed to depend on them for support.' To send out either the aged or the young, in an unprotected state, would be at once ill-advised and inhuman: but if, as a general rule, the able-bodied are competent to support their families as well as themselves at home, they should, *a fortiori*, be able to do so where labour is more productive, where wages are higher, and where the necessities of life are cheaper.

Equally, then, for the sake of the emigrants themselves, and to secure the moral well-being of the communities they found, it is the duty of the State so to lessen the cost of passage as to permit families to go forth collectively. The interference of the State is necessary not less for another purpose, — that, of duly providing for the religious training, the literary instruction, and the civil discipline of the infant community. In the first establishment of our early American colonies the question of Religion at least, was not neglected. The importance then attached to it is illustrated by the following striking passage from Mr. Godley's 'Memorial' on Irish Colonization: — 'Reverting to the past, we are convinced that the Church of England in Virginia, the Roman Catholic in Maryland, Quakerism in Pennsylvania, and Puritanism in New England, were the principal causes respectively of the stability of society in those colonies of England, and of their wonderful advancement in material prosperity. Nay, more, the student of the colonial history of England will not fail to observe that the prosperity of the old English colonies in America seems to have been in a pretty equal ratio to the influences of religion on the emigrants; the colonies in which religious provisions were neglected were the least prosperous; those in which they were more regarded were more prosperous; and the most prosperous of modern colonies, — those of New England, — were, in fact, Levitical communities, almost entirely governed and managed by influences of a religious kind.' Far different has been the state of things in our more recent settlements. Their physical progress has been one of extraordinary rapidity. But what has been their moral condition? It would be unjust to suppose that in such a question the settler himself takes no interest, until, indeed, necessity and the long continued neglect

of the State have habituated him to a condition which he at first recoiled from. 'The sound of the church-going bell' will be long missed. The efforts which he is willing to make are touchingly described in the following extract from the evidence of Mrs. Chisholm, whose experience and benevolent exertions on behalf of Australian emigrants attach an additional interest to her observations. Examined before the Colonization Committee, she states:—

'On one occasion I called at a shepherd's hut,—a man whose wages were 25*l.*; the wife was a very managing woman; from being able to accommodate persons in travelling, and allowing them to sleep in the house, she made a few pounds more in the course of the year. Going to look at her premises, I found a very small hut, neatly built. I said, "What is this?" "Oh!" she replied, "that is a library; that is the place for the man we have got to teach the children. We know teachers do not like our conversation always, and they like to be quiet sometimes; and we have made him this little place for his books and for the children." They paid the teacher 8*l.* a year, although they had a large family; and then by attending other families the teacher would make a very comfortable living. . . . They often expressed themselves to me, "Education is a very good thing; but without religion I am afraid it will not do much good."

Freed from many temptations which belong to old communities, if deprived of many of their enjoyments, colonial life might be expected to be, though neither primitive nor Arcadian, yet eminently characterised by simplicity, purity, a contented disposition, and a spirit of mutual help: And we have seen too with what aspirations that life is often undertaken. But very different are the descriptions which we hear of it as a reality, even from the most enlightened and zealous advocates of Colonization. The following is a sample.

'The colonial soil everywhere seems highly favourable to the growth of conduct which, without being criminal according to law, is very much objected to by the better sort of people in this country. I mean all those acts which, in Upper Canada and the state of New York, are called "smart" conduct; which consist of taking advantage or over-reaching, of forgetting promises, of betraying confidence, of unscrupulously sacrificing all the other numbers to "number one." In colonies such conduct is commonly termed clever, 'cute, dexterous; in this country it is called dishonourable: the honourable colonists, who strongly disapprove of such conduct, more especially if they are recent emigrants of the better order, often call it "colonial." For the growth of honour, in a word, the colonies are not a very congenial soil. Neither is knowledge successfully cultivated there. In all the colonies, without exception, it is common to meet with people of the greatest mark in the colony, who are ignorant of everything but the art of getting money. British ignorance keeps no man down, if he has in a large degree the one quality which is highly

prized in the colonies,—the quality of knowing how to grow rich. In hardly any colony can you manage, without great difficulty, to give your son what is esteemed a superior education here; and in all colonies, the sons of many of the first people are brought up in a wild unconsciousness of their own intellectual degradation.

Colonial manners are hardly better than morals, being slovenly, coarse, and often far from decent, even in the higher ranks,—I mean, in comparison with the manners of the higher ranks here. Young gentlemen who go out there are apt to forget their home manners, or to prefer those of the colony; and one sees continually such cases as that of a young member of a most respectable family here, who soon becomes in the colony, by means of contamination, a thorough-paced blackguard. If the bad propensities of colonists are not, as much as we could wish them, under the restraint of honour, or reason, or usage, neither are they under that of religion. . . . In many parts of some colonies there is, I may say, no religion at all; and wherever this happens, the people fall into a state of barbarism.\*

Such pictures, we would fain believe, may be over-coloured: nor indeed is the passage we have quoted intended to represent the condition of all our colonies: yet, after making due allowances, when we consider by what training the various nations of Europe have been formed; by what discipline of virtue and courage their national integrity has been maintained and their politics have been moulded; through how many high influences, chivalrous and religious, their social fabric has been reared up; and by what ennobling struggles and high nurture of ancient learning and modern art and science they have become developed into that which we see them; it is certainly hard to see how communities, such as Mr. Wakefield describes, are to grow into nations worthy to bear the name, and able to receive the impress of the country which gave them birth, and is, in a great degree, responsible for their destinies. It is one thing to spread into vast commercial firms, and another thing to consolidate into nations. Let this, however, be carefully remembered:—that the forfeit will be exacted; and that, if England does not train up her colonial children to be like her, she will herself very probably decline into a miserable likeness of them. No evils are so contagious as those which Mr. Wakefield describes; nor is it possible to be in constant intercourse with societies in which they predominate, without insensibly catching their corruption however little their counterbalancing good qualities may be shared. It is not merely the political institutions of colonies which react, by imitation and sympathy, on those of the countries which founded them,—moral habits and social tendencies are still more rapidly transferred. There are qualities in

---

\* A View of the Art of Colonization. E. G. Wakefield, 1849.



which even the United States are inferior to what, we think, they would have been, had the parent country, not only at their first settlement, but during her subsequent government of them, been faithful to the high duty of fashioning them after the pattern of her own religion, laws, arts, and, as far as possible, her social institutes and manners. In every Englishman there is an American, Australian or New Zealand settler: and in every such colonist there is also, or might have been, an Englishman: and the struggle between the two elements of each character is a type of the mutual influence reciprocally exercised by nation upon nation. Upon the issue of this struggle depends that which is for us the most interesting of all political questions,—namely, whether the England of the past shall be lost in the England of the future, or shall blend with, exalt, and sustain it;—whether she shall retain her elevation while she extends her resources, or become transformed as her children are too often transformed, when loosed from native traditions, and cast upon un-historic shores. Here, as elsewhere, action and reaction will meet and respond to each other. A common fortune, like a common blood, must belong to parent and to child; and if England does not breed up young Nations, let her see that she does not herself insensibly degenerate into a ‘new country.’

Whether then we consider the case of England or that of Ireland;—whether we regard the ultimate destinies of the nation, or the urgency of the present trial,—we can find no refuge from the conviction that the assistance of the State to emigration is necessary. How then, it will be asked, is it to be imparted? And in the first place, whence are the funds to come? It has already been shown how large is the benefit of emigration to the class of proprietors and occupiers, as well as to the emigrants themselves; nor can any one peruse the papers laid before Parliament by the Colonial Office, filled as they have been for years with vehement appeals from the colonies, without perceiving that they too derive a benefit at least as great from a timely and sufficient supply of labour. All these parties, then, ought to contribute to what is their common gain; and as there is no class in the community whose prosperity is not interwoven with theirs, the State, as the representative of all, ought to contribute her presiding care, ought to direct their united exertions, and, where necessary, ought to advance the funds required, on sufficient security. In most cases the emigrant already pays; but he pays more than his share, and is consequently exposed to severer hardships than need be his lot. In some cases the colonies pay; but they also pay more than their fair proportion, and are therefore unable to procure nearly as

many labourers as they desire. Until lately, the Australian colonies obtained labourers at a cost of about 18*l*. a head. The charge is now less, but it is still, for first-class labourers, very high. Not unnaturally, therefore, they complain of having to pay 1*l*. an acre for land, which, at an exorbitant rate of wages, makes them a small return. How different would the return made on that land be, if they were enabled, at the same cost, to import double the number of labourers equally serviceable. This is a question of especial significance for those who are favourable to a high upset price of land. Whatever may be that mysterious sum, the 'sufficient price'—a question into which we need not enter—it is evident that the price which, not only may be imposed on land, but can be received for it, must depend mainly upon the price of the labour already in the colonial market. To place upon colonial land a price sufficient to defray the emigration of the labourers, if the colony be remote, will be to name a price which capitalists cannot pay, because the sufficient labour is not already there. The State must therefore, in such a case, either take the initiative by such a grant or loan as will supply the labour before the sale has taken place, or must aid the immigration funds procured through such sales, with funds from other sources. An improved land revenue is one of the many advantages that may then be looked for in return. Something has at last been done to assist the colonies in this mode. A loan has been sanctioned in New South Wales, and the funds of individuals at home have been combined, under Government superintendence, with those sent from the colonies. The intention thus manifested has been excellent, and the colony at least has profited by the provision; but the numbers thus removed, though not inconsiderable, are far from being such as materially to affect the home country.

The principle then being established, that those who gain by emigration should contribute to its cost, whatever sums the State found it expedient to advance in the first instance for that purpose, should remain as a primary charge on the properties benefited by it. In some cases the occupier of the land would probably be able to offer sufficient security for the loan; but the proprietor would more often be the party with whom the State could safely deal. Such loans would generally be necessary only on an extraordinary emergency: But on such occasions they would constitute by far the cheapest as well as most effectual means of relief. For no other species of loan could the land afford an equally unexceptionable security; because no other process strikes so surely at the root of that disease which undermines

all property. In many parts of Ireland and Scotland, proprietors are obviously unable to afford the aid required: in both countries therefore, and in parts of England also, it would seem a wise course to act on the precedent already established in the instance of Government loans for agricultural improvements.

By some persons it has been proposed to place the funds granted in aid of emigration at the disposal of the Poor-law Guardians; and thus in fact to make emigration, not only auxiliary to the Poor-law, but actually a part of it. On many grounds, however, we cannot but deem it a sounder, as well as juster policy, to resort to the more responsible agency of the proprietors; and to make them individually answerable for the repayment of the sums advanced. In accepting such loans proprietors would, practically, pledge themselves to prevent, so far as in them lay, the recurrence of pauperism, by discouraging, for instance, all methods of agriculture not favourable to industry, co-operation, and prudence, and by steadily withstanding the process of subletting or dividing farms. They should therefore be allowed as large a discretion in the use of the funds for which they are accountable, as is consistent with the interests of the whole community, including the colony. On the other hand it is plain, that to connect assisted emigration with a poor-law agency, is to attach a premium to pauperism; and to make the workhouse itself, not a test of destitution, but a half-way house to that which the Irish poor wisely consider the most effectual of all means of advancement. The actual pauper, moreover, is likely to become a less successful emigrant, as well as one less acceptable in the colonies, than a man who still struggles bravely to maintain his independence. The former would be assisted to emigrate by the guardians, the latter more often by the proprietor, who would thus be enabled to go through that inevitable process, the consolidation of farms too minute for profitable cultivation, without reducing to the class of paupers those who have no longer the means of earning a subsistence. Nor should it be forgotten that the loan is more certain of being punctually repaid, if the security for it be the property of an individual than if it were that of a public body, which affords a mark less easily hit, and in which the sense of responsibility is always less strong. The individual proprietor will also be more likely than a public board could be, to recover from the assisted emigrant (connected with him as he is by personal ties), a portion of the money which he has himself to repay: And so might, perhaps, be solved what has always been found to be a most arduous problem—the recovery of a fair contribution from the emigrant himself, after his colonial career has enabled him to pay it. The

sums advanced should be used in reducing the cost of passage; and the emigrants thus assisted (to insure their eligibility as such), should be subjected to rules analogous to those which have hitherto been insisted on in the case of Australian emigration. Supposing the cost of passage to be reduced by these means to one half, it is to be observed that far more than double the number would be enabled to emigrate. The class which can afford to pay 15*l.* for the emigration of a family is probably four times as numerous as that which could pay 30*l.*; and it consists likewise of the right persons — men who, where employment is not to be had at home, must be a drain upon their country's resources.

But here, again, the advocates for an assisted emigration are met by a host of objections; some of which are plausible at first sight. To assist emigration, it is asserted by some, will but check the individual exertions made at present. Large sums are annually sent from America to Ireland to promote the emigration of friends. Would you dry up, it is asked, that source of aid? Assuredly not: but the assertion that assistance must paralyse individual efforts, is based on the assumption that this assistance is to be very injudiciously bestowed. There is surely such a thing as helping a man to help himself — such a thing as developing, not overlaying, individual exertions, by seasonable and discriminating aid. The aid given to the Irish poor by their friends who have preceded them to America, apparently increases, instead of superseding, their own efforts; nor is it to be supposed that the assistance at present afforded by Irish proprietors, is so much money thrown away. No one will deny that the State might spend a very large sum of money without doing any proportionate good, if it set about the task by offering to pay the expenses of any one who chose to emigrate. But if some such mode of distributing the fund as has been suggested were adopted, it seems nearly certain that proprietors, obliged to repay the money entrusted to them, and in possession of local knowledge, would spend the additional funds as they spend those which they now devote to emigration, — giving a certain sum on condition of the like sum being produced by the recipient, — or, at least, taking care that the money borrowed was used to the best advantage, and displaced no individual exertion.

Another objection, sometimes brought against assisted emigration, is of an opposite character. Emigration assisted by the State, it is said, will be effectual, no doubt; but it will be so excessive as to swamp the colonial markets and those of the United States. This statement again would seem to be mere assumption. In the first place, emigration of a sound character might do twice as much good as that which is taking place at

present, without being larger than it is. So far as that emigration has been an emigration of small capitalists, it has done evil, not good. Supposing Irish emigration during the last year to have consisted but in one third part of such emigration, and in two thirds of that of the labouring poor (a very flattering supposition), then, setting the loss against the gain, the latter will be represented by an emigration of but one third the number which actually crossed the sea. In other words, an emigration not conducted on the voluntary principle, but aided, directed, and therefore consisting of the right class, might, without being larger, do three times as much good in Ireland as that now going on.

But, in the second place, there is no reason to doubt that a far larger number of emigrants than has ever yet left our shores could find employment. Let us take the case of the United States alone. Every argument which proves that labour at a rate of wages not unreasonably high, is the first requisite for the prosperity of a colony, applies as well to the oldest of British colonies as to the youngest. But, as long as the United States include vast tracts of fertile land unoccupied or hardly cultivated, an exorbitant rate of wages must remain the chief obstacle to the accumulation of large profits, and to the development of the national resources. The United States might, it is said, take advantage of our necessity, by the imposition of a high emigrant tax. This may indeed be conjectured: but what we know is, that the United States, like the legislatures of our North American colonies, have already seen the expediency of reducing the excessive emigrant tax so hastily imposed. The alarm which led to the emigrant tax in Canada was a dread of fever not of numbers; and the same resolution which deprecated the emigration of the sick affirmed the usefulness of a wisely conducted emigration. The United States, however, have never had substantial cause for alarm. And, if the proceeds of a moderate emigrant tax were applied to the dispersion of the newly arrived emigrants among those districts in which labour is most needed, it is evident from all American statistics that there would hardly be a practical limit to the numbers which the United States could profitably absorb.

As little grounds are there for the assumption that our colonies are unable to absorb a larger number of labourers than they receive at present. Look only to the case of our Australian colonies. Within the last month intelligence has been received that a fresh loan has been negotiated by New South Wales for the purpose of introducing additional labourers. That colony, then, does not suffer from repletion. We are assured by the most competent authorities — those who possess

the most accurate local knowledge and whose interests are identified with them — that, even without an attempt to avail ourselves of the vast and fertile regions lately discovered by Sir Thomas Mitchell and others, we have not as yet come within sight of a limit to the numbers whom the Australian colonies could employ, were the immigrants distributed where they are wanted. The following statement is made by Colonel Macarthur: —

‘It appears that in eighteen months during 1841 and 1842, not less than 30,000 immigrants had arrived at Sydney and Port Phillip, of whom about 25,330 were men, women, and children of the labouring class. This addition to the number of colonists constituted at that time almost one fourth of the entire population of New South Wales, as shown by the previous census of March 1841.

‘Yet not only did the colony *give employment to every available labourer*, at wages sufficiently high to enable him and his family to live comfortably and well, but possessed food in such abundance that the markets, so far from rising by reason of this great increase to the number of the inhabitants, had, on the contrary, a tendency to fall. . . . With subsistence, and a variety of exchangeable products augmenting more rapidly than the population, if in 1842, New South Wales could receive with advantage an influx of persons amounting to almost one fourth of the inhabitants, it could at this time, with a population of 200,000, admit into its social system, perhaps, fully 50,000 men, women, and children,—provided they were conveyed, not in one mass, but by monthly drafts, until the whole were located and advantageously distributed in the colony.’ (Appendix to Minutes of Evidence, Colonization Committee, 1847.)

The effect indeed of every such immigration, we are assured by the Australian witnesses, is to open out a new and yet larger field of employment: and the reason why the capacity of a successful colony to absorb labour increases so rapidly, lies on the surface of the subject. In proportion, as labourers are largely introduced, that excessive rate of wages is lowered by which alone the natural advantages of a new soil are neutralised. Wages becoming moderate, the profits of employers rise, and fresh capital is invested in the colony: while the additional land sales which this occasions, supply a new fund for the importation of immigrants; and thus, while cheap labour and large capital reproduce each other, employment is found for daily augmenting numbers. It is true that local congestions of population may take place, and have taken place, in colonies, large portions of which were actually at the moment in want of labour. Such congestions, however, are removed in the natural course of things; and the temporary inconvenience is comparatively slight, in regions where food at least, is abundant. To avoid the chance of these local pressures,

different suggestions have repeatedly come from the colonies themselves. One of them is, that the ships to be sent out in future under the superintendence of Government, should land their emigrants not only at the chief towns of the several settlements, but at various other places along the coast, where labour is required. This is the opinion expressed by Mr. Lefroy, as well as by many others. He says:—

‘Due notice should be given to the colonies of the intention of the Government to carry such a measure into execution, and great care should be taken in selecting the different points all round the coast of Australia at which the emigrants are to be landed. As for instance, take the case of New South Wales; they should not be, as hitherto they have been, all landed at Sidney, or divided equally between the ports of Melbourne and Sidney, but they should be landed at least in a dozen points, round the whole length of the coast line.’

Another suggestion, also frequently made by others, will be found in the evidence of Mr. Jackson.

‘I would have depôts of labour in various parts of the colony; as at the different seaports and at places in the interior, eligible as the sites of future villages or towns, so that the men who might be congregated in those depôts might be advantageously employed by the Government on public works. This has been done, in point of fact, whenever there has been a temporary accumulation of labour. But what has been done just to meet the exigency of the moment, I would adopt as a general principle in Colonization. There is so much that the Government has to do in the way of public works in young countries; they have to create suddenly that which has been accumulating in England for centuries.’ (P. 220.)

The capacity of our colonies to receive that redundant population which must otherwise prey on the very vitals of Great Britain, is a subject the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated. What we part with, however, assuredly is not valueless: It is the precious life-blood,—which is dangerous only when in excess. It is not the infirm, the halt, or the blind, whom we would assist to emigrate: the chimney-corner is the best place for them: and we but make room for true charity by the removal of a class whose support ought to be their labour. Why then should we give our strength to what is now a foreign, and what alas! may one day be, a hostile power? If our colonial labour markets be indeed full, which we are far from believing, are there no means of extending them? We are assured, by a host of colonial authorities, that their capacities may be increased—increased, indeed, to an extent known only where employment begets employment,—through the undertaking of those great industrial works which pass the efforts of individuals, and

in the absence of which private employment will so often lack a field. How large a portion of the employment given, even in old countries, is afforded by the State or by public bodies, may be guessed by any one who glances at the canals, bridges, railroads, &c. of England, and of the Continent. Works of an analogous sort are every day pointed out by persons connected with the colonies; and such undertakings are assuredly more necessary for the progress of a new country than for the prosperity of an old one. Let the State, then, without superseding private exertions, do what it easily may to encourage and combine them.

With a view solely to the interest of the colony itself, public works have been recommended as certain to repay their cost, so numerous that if the best of them only were undertaken, it is hard to say to what extent our present colonial labour markets would be enlarged. The following may serve as a sample. Mr. Pemberton observes, p. 94., Evidence of 1847 : — ‘ A railroad from Kingston to Lake Huron; that is one which has been proposed; but as a speculation it is beyond the means of private individuals. 942. Could you state the difference in the distance between Kingston and the waters of the Georgian Bay, in Lake Huron, by any railroad that could be constructed there, and the present water communication? — I think it would be a difference of about 1000 miles.’ Captain Rubidge observes — ‘ A railroad leading from the town of Peterborough to Lake Ontario, a distance of twenty-nine miles, would immediately treble the amount of exports from the district. The people have lately held meetings to raise stock for this purpose; but, unaided, I fear there is little hope of success. They would be very willing to submit to a tax to gradually repay the interest, and, at a given time, the principal of a loan.’ Mr. Perley gives evidence to the same effect : — ‘ Dalhousie is a seaport at the mouth of the river Restigouche at the head of the bay of Chaleur. By the present road to Dalhousie, that by which the mail travels, the distance is 225 miles, whilst it is only 100 miles in a straight line from Fredericton to Dalhousie across the country. But we have not the means of making that road, and opening up that line of country.’ To the same effect is the evidence of Mr. Stephen Hale Marsh, Mr. Bradley, and others.

The number of persons thus enabled to settle in the colonies would increase in a geometrical ratio. The emigrants who had been employed for a year on such works, would at the end of that time be enabled to provide for themselves in other ways — leaving their places vacant for a fresh detachment. By de-



gress establishing themselves on the land, they would form other settlements, between which and the main line of communication through the country additional roads must become necessary. The lands in the immediate neighbourhood of such roads would of course acquire an additional value: capitalists will then be attracted to them and will require additional labourers, who, in their turn, will become capitalists; and thus our colonies might in a few years make a progress which, without a wise expenditure in the first instance, they could not have made till the lapse of half a century. Such interposition on the part of the State for the purpose of accelerating a natural if not inevitable process, would be no interference with the course which capital is disposed to take: it is only to tap the springs of national prosperity, leaving the currents thenceforth to flow in their natural channels.

Nor is it to be forgotten that there are other and most important advantages to be derived from such works in colonies, independently of their immediate pecuniary return. During a succession of years, and on the authority of successive governors, a railway has been earnestly recommended between Halifax and Quebec. It was advocated partly as the most effectual means for rendering accessible the interior of the country and giving to our North American Colonies the benefit of a port open throughout the winter; and partly on political grounds, as a great line of military communication. Even before railways were thought of, a military road was considered an object of the first importance. The line for the railway was at last surveyed; and nothing could be more favourable than the report made on it by the engineer employed. The colonies were zealous that the work should be undertaken: the State legislatures were unanimous. In this country, men rejoiced in the prospect of a work, which at so momentous a crisis might have caused a demand for thirty or forty thousand additional labourers, besides opening out four or five millions of acres for settlement. What proceeding has been adopted after so long a delay? Major Robinson's final report was submitted to the English Railway Commissioners! That body of course confined their deliberations almost to a single point,—namely, the amount of profit which might be looked for on the line, as an ordinary railroad speculation. The opinion delivered on this point was unfavourable: accordingly nothing more has been heard respecting an enterprise more important, perhaps, than any which in recent times has been undertaken for the consolidation of the colonial empire of England, and the development of its remoter resources.

It is not, however, in this spirit—penny-wise and pound-foolish—that a great nation should deliberate, at a great crisis, on measures worthy of its highest energies. There are cases, no doubt, in which the immediate question of profit and loss is all in all. But a nation is sometimes called on to deal with other matters; and on occasions which demand somewhat of generous enterprise, of far-sighted wisdom, and it may be, of immediate self-sacrifice, such qualities can no more be dispensed with than the humblest of our nature. While we have doubted and hesitated, the United States, with far slighter immediate inducements, but with greater political foresight, have acted. They have already executed a large portion of a rival railway—that from Portland to Montreal—which, if left without a competitor, will transfer to our aspiring neighbours the traffic between Upper Canada and the Atlantic. It is not at home only that we shall suffer from a mode of proceeding, which so strikingly illustrates the difference between real prudence, and that poor caution which can gain nothing, because it will risk nothing and advance nothing. It is impossible that our colonies should not feel the contrast between their comparatively languid growth and the rapid progress of the United States. We speak not of the Canadas only, but of New Brunswick also, which with its 11,000,000 of unappropriated acres does not grow corn enough to support itself, and, after the closing of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, remains, like Nova Scotia, dependent on the United States for its supply. Well indeed may Major Robinson remark, in his able report on this proposed line of railway:—‘Most unfavourable comparisons are made by travellers who visit the British Provinces and the United States. And some have gone so far as to state, that travelling along where the boundary is a mere conventional line, they could at once tell whether they were in the States or not. On the one side, the State Governments become shareholders to a large amount in great public works, lead the way, and do not hesitate to incur debt, for making what has been called “war upon the wilderness:” employment is given, and by the time the improvement is completed, property has been created, and the employed become proprietors. On the other side the Provincial Governments do not take the initiative in the same manner; and hence in the settlements, and in the provinces generally, may be seen this marked difference in the progress of people who are identically the same in every respect.’ This is a question which every day becomes more serious. Deep-seated discontents fling themselves upon the first pretext that presents itself, however

hostile: but if they be rooted in reasonable causes, their ultimate effects must be calamitous, however irrational or blameable may be their occasional expression. Our choice is limited. We may, if we please, discard our colonies: but if we would keep them, together with the greatness of our country, we must keep the hearts of our colonists; and these will be found not altogether divided from their interests.

It is impossible here to discuss all the suggestions relative to emigration, which have been recently made by witnesses examined before the Colonization Committee. Many important hints on the subject are to be found also in the various series of papers recently submitted to Parliament. They include the guarantee of a certain low rate of interest on loans raised by the colonies in order to carry on useful public works; the actual participation in the cost of such works; a combination of funds supplied by the sale of lands in the colonies with home funds, whether supplied by emigrants, by proprietors, or by Poor-law Boards; the reservation for the same purpose of a portion of the wages paid to labourers employed on public works; a tax on wild lands to defray the cost of passage, and the advance of money for the same purpose on the credit of that rent which a large immigration can alone produce.

Another suggestion, strongly urged, is that new ports with suitable establishments should be selected for the embarkation of assisted emigrants. A memorial recently addressed to Lord Grey from South Australia, complains that emigrant vessels have hitherto been despatched exclusively from London and Plymouth, and has earnestly recommended that vessels should be sent from 'various other ports, such as Liverpool, Bristol, Leith, Glasgow, Dundee, Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Londonderry, Belfast,' &c.

We shall notice also a suggestion, made by Mr. Cunningham, and confirmed by Colonel Macarthur, — respecting the establishment of a Colonial Board of Emigration in this country. Mr. Cunningham expresses himself thus:—

'I have no doubt that every colony should have either a board or a representative at the board. Each colony should have an agent, in the confidence of the colony; because the difficulty of the colonists is this, that one of the most important branches of colonial business, viz., the selection and supply of labourers whose passage is paid from colonial funds, whose wages are to be received from colonists, and whose employment is in the service of the colonists,—this branch, I say, of colonial business is managed, not merely in its principles, but in its minute details, by a board not appointed by the colony, nor in any way under its control, and consisting of gentlemen who, however

anxious to do justice to the subject, and however well acquainted with official documents, cannot have the time to bestow on the wants of each one of a large number of colonies which the importance of the subject demands, and that with men who, whatever may be their knowledge of documents, have not that practical knowledge of each colony which can only be gained by having lived in it, and for the want of which no perusal of official returns can in any manner compensate.'

In considering the various modes by which we might soon enable our colonies to absorb a far larger population than they can now employ, we must not forget one which, though it may possibly not be found necessary, would certainly prove efficient—the formation within them of new settlements. Here, again, we are met by objectors, who assure us that the expense of such settlements will be so great as to render them impracticable. The assumptions, however, upon which they reason, are generally fallacious. They begin by calculating the expense of settling emigrants according to some exorbitant scale founded on the blundering proceedings of times long gone by; they demand next what is the number who stand in need of emigration, and they finally ask whether it be possible for such a number to emigrate at such a cost? The first error in this method of reasoning consists in a forgetfulness of the fact, that a new settlement is necessary only as a germ which, if successful, will grow of itself, and without further charge. The second consists in an estimate of the original cost either greatly exaggerated, or excluding all notice of the compensating benefits by which it is in part repaid even at the time. When it is urged that to settle emigrants on land in British North America will require an outlay of 20*l.*, or at least of 12*l.* per head, the assertion is justified by such reasons as the following: 'You must allow so much,' it is said, 'for the passage across the sea—so much for making the roads immediately necessary, building houses, &c.,—so much for clearing,—and then food for fifteen months, as the emigrants will arrive too late to have a crop the first year.' Now, in the first place, this calculation obviously counts the same items several times over; for the wages spent upon road-making, clearing, and building should, of themselves, support the new settlers until their crops are fit to be reaped;—even supposing that the simple course has not been adopted, of clearing and sowing a small portion of the land destined for them, in anticipation of their arrival. In the second place, it omits all consideration of the momentous facts that the land thus cleared may in a short time be sold at a price which (paid by instalments) will fully make up for the cost of clearance, and that

the adjoining land will also sell at a price double that which it could otherwise have fetched. In the third place, it is to be remembered, that if the site for the settlement has been well chosen, the road to it will probably be part of one to some remoter settlement, or at least will open out a tract of valuable country. In several instances these collateral advantages have completely shifted the balance from the debtor to the creditor side of the account.

In order to make a settlement economically, the first thing necessary is, that it should be undertaken conjointly with the construction of a road. Such was the case in the instance of two successful settlements referred to by Commissary General Filder in the following extract from a letter to Sir C. Trevelyan: —

‘ There have been two instances of successful settlements formed by the local government here. . . . In one of them the government opened a road (the Garrafeasen Road), giving out the work in small portions of one or two miles each. There were thus numerous contractors employed, all of whom were paid one half in cash and one half in land, wherever they might choose to locate themselves on ungranted land. In the other instance the government opened a road (from Oakville on Lake Ontario to Owen’s Sound on Lake Huron), and paid the whole cost in cash; after it was completed the government offered free grants of land, of fifty acres each, on condition of actual settlement: And the whole extent of the road was speedily settled on these terms;’ &c.

The same causes seem to have led to the same effects in the case of two settlements in New Brunswick, described by Mr. Perley, the Emigration Agent in that colony, (p. 22.): —

‘ Two very striking instances of the success attending the formation of new settlements in the wilderness by associations of settlers, having the privilege of making their own roads at a reasonable rate, exist in York County. The Harvey Settlement was formed in 1837, by a party of emigrants from the north of England, who landed in New Brunswick in a very destitute condition. A report upon this settlement was presented to the Lieutenant-Governor, on the 9th February 1844, accompanied by a statistical return. This report states that it is shown by the return that from land where not a tree was felled in July 1837, there had been taken during the preceding autumn, 260 tons of hay and straw, and 15,000 bushels of grain, potatoes, and turnips; and that the great success which had attended the labours of these industrious and valuable settlers, afforded an unquestionable proof of what might be done on the millions of wild land in New Brunswick. The return shows the number of settlers to be forty-four, and the value of the improvements to be 4,289*l.* 10*s.*’

The second of these settlements was an Irish one. Mr. Perley describes it as follows: —

'I can mention the "Teetotal Settlement," which was an Irish settlement, formed by people from Cork and Kerry. It was formed in 1842, under the same commissioner, by a party of destitute emigrants from the south of Ireland. In a report from the commissioner, dated 25th January 1844, it is thus stated: "The results of the second effort in which I have been engaged in forming settlements in the wilderness have afforded me the most unmingled satisfaction. Where but two years ago stood a dense forest, there have been gathered by thirty-five settlers during the past autumn 7,286 bushels of grain, potatoes and turnips. The accompanying return shows an estimated value of 1,137*l.* in buildings and clearings; and when there is added to this the market value of the crop, exceeding 800*l.*, we have about 2,000*l.* return (exclusive of the making four and a quarter miles of road) from a tract of land which in its wilderness state would not in the same time have produced a shilling. I cannot now consider the successful occupation of our wild lands by associated bodies of settlers, having the privilege of making their own roads at a reasonable rate, as a doubtful experiment.'

The last-named settlements appear to have been made without any loss whatever. The two settlements effected by Mr. Peter Robinson in the years 1823 and 1825, were on the contrary very expensive, the former costing 22*l.* a head, and the latter 21*l.* 6*s.* The settlement made under Lord Seaton in 1831, was much cheaper. Mr. Robinson's settlements, however, were costly, from causes well known and easily avoided: and in the long run they were productive of great advantages.

The following statement of Commander Rubidge illustrates their collateral effects (p. 277.): —

'2665. To what do you attribute the extraordinary improvement and change between your first visit to this district and your present knowledge of it? — I attribute it, in the first place, to the emigrants brought out under the superintendence of the Honourable Peter Robinson. At that time there was not a mill in the country; there was scarcely any road; and the whole country was in a languishing state.'

Another answer of his throws yet further light on the subject.

'2683. Do you know that the first emigrants assisted in bringing other emigrants from Ireland? — Yes. I should say that every family that the Government has located in the Colborne District has been the means of bringing about *five times the number* to join them as voluntary emigrants. They are coming out every year.'

Thus, then, although Mr. Robinson's first settlement cost the preposterous sum of 22*l.* per head, yet the germ there planted has attracted to itself so many emigrants since, that if the original charge be distributed over the total number who have profited by it, the expense becomes less than 4*l.* 10*s.*

per head, — being about the sum required to maintain a pauper in the workhouse during a single year! The same large accession to the original number of emigrants has taken place, as Captain Rubidge informs us, in the second settlement, that of Dummer.

The increased value given to the land in the neighbourhood of new settlements is a consideration of the utmost importance in estimating the real cost of such settlements. In order to render such increased value more immediately available, an ingenious proposition has been made, to reserve *alternate* lots, and sell them, at an advanced price, after the intermediate portions have been settled. Such is Mr. Uniacke's suggestion (p. 54.).

The formation of new settlements does not by any means assume that the emigrants settled on the land ought to be those most recently introduced into the colony. The evidence of all persons connected with our colonies, whether by office or by mere residence, proves that the raw recruit is not the fittest person to become a settler, and that in order to acquire the knowledge as well as the hardy habits required for the wilderness, he ought to be thrown for a year upon the labour market. This advantage will be attained, if, as has been suggested, the settlement is begun by the construction of a road, whether the newly arrived emigrant, or one whose place in the colonial labour market is thus left vacant, be employed upon it. That with the aid of new settlements constructed on systematic principles, and scattered over the country with due mutual relations, the population of our colonies might safely advance at a far more rapid rate than it has done hitherto, is as certain, as that we can propagate a plant more rapidly by laying its branches along the ground and making them take root at their several joints than by merely sticking a shoot into the soil. Several years ago, a scheme for the creation of settlements was suggested by Lord Grey to the colonial authorities; and it is greatly to be regretted that, in deference to their objections, it was withdrawn untried, without amendment, and without the substitution of any other. The formation of new settlements if successfully carried out, would include among its many advantages that of rendering emigration popular in the colony. Every new settlement would almost necessarily benefit an older one: the general value of land must be increased and the capital already existing daily find more profitable employment.

Our limits preclude us from all but a passing allusion to many other important parts of this wide subject. Of these the use of Companies is one. It would be paradoxical to deny

that much of their effective agency may be adapted to the purposes of colonization, as well as to the countless other useful purposes of modern life; while, on the other hand, those who remember that colonies are destined to grow up into nations, may hesitate to commit their moral destinies to a directing power not influenced by higher motives and a more far-seeing wisdom, than commonly guide the operations of a trading association. It is in the subordinate functions of detail, accordingly, that we think they will be chiefly serviceable; and most interesting would it be to ascertain what those precise services are: whether large or numerous companies are to be preferred, — how far their efforts might be incited by grants of land, and other aid accorded in proportion to the number of emigrants whom they had settled in a given time; and whether, on the other hand, a security might not be found against inactivity or reckless speculation, by conditions involving the forfeiture of their lands if the privileges conceded had not, within a prescribed time, been turned to account.

In passing in review the various modes by which emigration can be carried on in a more systematic manner, and, if necessary, on a larger scale than it has yet been, we have left unnoticed one most important department of the subject, namely, the creation of new colonies. But we have not shrunk from entering upon that question, merely because the establishment of new colonies is a costly work. Every productive work is expected to cost something in the first instance; and true prudence is equally antagonistic to prodigality and to niggardliness. If our existing colonies constitute a large part of our national wealth as well as greatness, there is no reason why our future colonies should not do so equally; or why, in the words of Mr. Mill, colonization should not pay 'like any other affair of business.' It is impossible, indeed, to read of those ample regions which Providence has thrown open to us, — of the still unoccupied tracts in almost every part of Australia, — of the boundless extent of fertile land at Natal, — of New Zealand, with its exquisite climate, its glorious scenery, and its soil adapted alike to agriculture and pasturage, — without a deep conviction that England, unless she prove unworthy of her high privileges, is destined to be, in every part of the globe, the mother and the guide — '*mater et caput*,' — of *Nations* yet unnamed. It is equally impossible to watch the progress of colonization in the United States, rudely as its mighty energies have hitherto been directed, — to see it add millions annually to its exchequer, and state after state to the Union — to see it stride, first to the Mississippi, and then to the Pacific, till a knot of thinly-peopled



republics on the eastern shores of America swells to an Imperial Confederation — which two oceans gird, and which already puts forth its feelers for the sceptre of a hemisphere, — without recognising the fact, that if the supremacy of those oceans be a matter of any moment, but one nation in the old world can enter into the generous emulation, and that she can do so only by pouring forth the strength of her race with rival energy, and raising up, in the remotest regions, affiliated or allied nations. We have abstained from the question of new colonies only because it is so vast a one, and because it would necessarily lead to discussions on subjects upon which so much has of late been ably written. We cannot too earnestly recommend to our readers the works of which we have prefixed the titles to this paper, especially Mr. Mill's text-book on Political Economy, Mr. Wakefield's important letters, and the able essay recently published by Mr. Roebuck. We have made no extended comment upon these books, because our limits rendered it impossible to do them justice; and because the object which their authors have at heart seemed most likely to be promoted by a general survey of the subject, such as we have attempted.

Among the high functions of colonization there is one which stands preeminently forward. It is this, — by colonization nations are enabled to retrieve the past. For the most part social errors, like public or private crimes, propagate themselves indefinitely; every endeavour to extricate ourselves from the consequences of one delinquency or error entangling us in new and worse. But colonization supplies at critical periods a tabula rasa; not only a 'place for repentance,' but time also and the means of amendment. The fearful pauperism which eats into the heart of England, has not grown up without grave faults, whether of individuals in past times, or of the State. The corruptions connected with the Poor-laws, the neglect of education, the want of due religious ministrations, especially in those districts most densely peopled under the stimulus of manufacturing industry, — these things, and many an abuse too late reformed, have all contributed to the evils which we now deplore. The consequence is, that the whole of our social fabric at present works uneasily; class is arrayed against class, principles are found every day 'more impracticable,' and statesmanship is becoming more and more a matter of mere tact and adaptation. Now Colonization would remove much of this pressure; give general ease and security, make room for staid counsels and conscientious courses, and preclude those immedicable evils which arise from legislating in a

panic, or legislating in a hurry. The breathing time thus afforded to those who are called on to set their house in order, would be especially precious in Ireland: nor will it be denied, that to that unhappy land such relief, if attainable, ought to be given, in justice as well as in policy. Whatever faults may be attributed, whether in past times or in present, to the various classes of that country, — whatever may have been the prodigality or selfishness of landlords, the indolence of farmers, or the lawlessness of the people, — there are few who now deny, though too many forget, the connexion which exists between the sufferings of recent times and the misgovernment, both by oppression and by neglect, of times past. The penal code is abolished, but the habits it engendered remain: and a system which interdicted the mass of the people from a career, from education, from property, and from self-respect, can not but have been instrumental in rendering them almost exclusively dependent on agriculture, and on that wretched system of agriculture the sole recommendation of which was, that it could dispense with science, with energy, and with capital, — and that it accommodated itself to the needs of a people whose domestic affections were strong, and whose standard of comfort was low. These laws were at last repealed; but the mischief had been done; and when, on the legislative Union, Ireland was called upon to run the race of greatness with her mature sister, she started with impaired energies and with a heavy load — an estate burdened by the original sin of accumulated pauperism. Whichever country we regard then, and whether we contemplate the governments of past times, or classes and individuals merely, there is something to be retrieved. Duty and policy require us to retrieve it: and colonization affords the opportunity.

In the colonies, also, there is a past to be redeemed, as well as a future to be provided for. Our recent colonies, indeed, have been rapid in their growth; but their physical prosperity, as we have observed, has not been accompanied by a proportionably sound state of moral training. In Van Diemen's Land, and till later times in New South Wales also, though fortunately not in our other Australian colonies, the same cause which promoted prosperity has been a source of moral corruption. We exported our felons, and made of them the seed of nations. Happy will it be for those nations, and for our future fame, if our utmost exertions shall prove sufficient to expel the poison from their veins. But the rank deposit which we have left on those remote shores has blighted some of the fairest regions of the earth with its exhalations: the vices of the old and the new world have met there, in one fermenting mass; — and in return those colonies occa-

sionally enjoyed cheap labour. The transportation system has, indeed, been mitigated in its character; but as yet no sufficient means have been taken to correct many of the evil effects it had left behind. We have learned, by terrible experience, that the convict population of a colony should never exceed a certain proportion to its free settlers. On the number, therefore, of our emigrants to any given settlement will depend the number of convicts which it can receive. The assistance hitherto given to emigration has not yet redressed the disproportion between the sexes; while the insufficient supply of labour, besides checking economical advancement, is answerable for further mischief, and introduces new vices of its own. An exorbitant rate of wages is as injurious as a depressed rate, to the cause of good morals, to the order, and even to the happiness of the labouring class. Labourers in these colonies have been known to abandon their work, adjourn to a tavern, and order expensive wines, while their employers actually rejoiced at those dissolute habits which, by wasting previous accumulations, postponed the hour at which it seemed not improbable that master and servant might otherwise have changed places! Year after year these evils have been the subject of persevering remonstrance. Permission was clamorously demanded for the introduction of Coolie or Chinese labour, if that of Englishmen was out of the question; and it is a fact, that some semi-savages from the New Hebrides and the South Sea Islands were at one time imported. There is no reason to suppose that this want of labour has been adequately met, by the subsequent exportation of some 2000 children from the Irish Poorhouses; or by that assisted emigration which still leaves the passage to Australia much more expensive than the unassisted passage to America. To these evils are to be added many others; for instance, the effects of the squatting system on the cultivation and sale of lands, enormous and unused grants to companies or individuals, and that far greater though negative calamity—a deficient provision for religious and moral education.

Such are the injuries bequeathed by former times. What has been done to redress them? An improved Passengers' Act has been passed; greatly to the comfort and safety of the emigrant. In the meantime, however, between a third or a fourth is added in consequence, to the cost of a passage to America or Canada, while no corresponding assistance has been given to the still more helpless outcast, who has no alternative except emigration or perpetual pauperism. The extraordinary expense to which Canada was subjected by the emigrant fever of 1847, it is true, has been defrayed by the mother country; but on the other hand, that ordinary contribution on her part, by which the emigrant

was forwarded to the place where he could procure employment, has been withdrawn. What has been done in these instances may have been well done, but surely too much has been left undone.

We have seen that the cause of England and of her colonies is one: nor is it less certain that on this, as on all occasions, both parts of the United Kingdom have a common interest. It has been too much the custom, of late, to speak of colonization as an exclusively Irish question. English pauperism, however, as well as Irish, is a disease that will brook little delay in its treatment. Allowing that the case of Ireland is the more pressing of the two, it is equally true that, in the removal of her load, England is immediately concerned, and to a vast pecuniary extent. The loss to the revenue, if Irish pauperism continues, must be large and increasing. Between the years 1823 and 1847, the amount of net balances of revenue remitted from the exchequer of Ireland to England, after defraying the expenses of Ireland, was more than nine millions sterling. It is much to be feared that a future return, exhibiting the financial relations between the two countries, will present a striking contrast. On the pauperism or prosperity of Ireland depends, also, the momentous question, whether England is to find in her a perpetual claimant on her bounty, or a profitable customer for her manufactures. An evil yet more formidable than any other exists in the constantly increasing immigration of the Irish into England. It will be to some a matter of surprise, that among the various classes to whom, during the last year, out-door relief was accorded by the express direction of the Irish Poor-law Commissioners, was that of families, the head of which was known to be absent from Ireland. If one effect of the present Irish Poor-law is to make a specific provision practically exonerating the Irish labourer from the duty of supporting his family, such a person, though he earned but a few pence a-day, would be better off in England than at home; and could not but prove a formidable rival to the English labourer, who is accustomed to a higher standard of life, and has a family to provide for. Swift complains, that in his time the magistrates and parish-officers on the western coasts of England 'followed the trade of exporting thither (to Ireland) their supernumerary beggars, in order to advance the Protestant interest among us, and these they are so kind as to send over gratis and duty free.' His suggestion, which is very characteristic, ends with the proposal, 'that they should be returned honestly back, as cheap as they came.' An irruption of Irish beggars into England, would probably be met in the same way: but the

question relates to labourers, not beggars; and the Irish labourer will be as well disposed to sell his labour in the dearest market, as the English farmer will be to buy the labour he requires in the cheapest. The inevitable effect, therefore, of such a state of things must be, to reduce in time the condition of the English labourer to that of the cottier from Cork or Kerry. In whatever degree, then, colonization is really necessary for Ireland, it must be necessary for English interests also; and, if the necessary relief be not afforded, the ultimate loss cannot but fall most heavily on that country which has most to lose. To Ireland, the cost of colonization compared with that of chronic pauperism would obviously be, though the whole of it were imposed as a charge on Irish property, like buying off a life annuity at one year's purchase. Colonization is, indeed, no panacea for her, or for any other country; it is, however, in her case not only one of the healing measures which she requires, but that one without which all others must truly remain inoperative. We have already seen that, in the absence of a sound emigration, no improved system of agriculture can take place, whether through the application of local resources, by the introduction of English capital, or by the sale of encumbered estates.

So rooted, however, is the aversion which some persons—a number daily diminishing—bear to colonization, that a man might at first infer that the whole world had long since been occupied, and that the plan proposed was to purchase a vast tract—perhaps from one of the South American republics—and to plant there a section of our people. Some such course may, indeed, one day be forced upon nations less fortunately circumstanced than England. But she is called upon only to avail herself of her own possessions, and of her tried powers; and to do, in her corporate capacity, what she expects each proprietor to do in his narrower sphere—to develop for the public need the resources of that boundless estate, which is hers in trust. What is it that those who deride the term ‘systematic emigration,’ (a term tantamount to colonization) really object to? Do they object to it on the ground that system in such matters is but pedantry? We should like them then to show what affair of business is carried on efficiently, what house is built, what ship is navigated, what branch of trade is made profitable, except through system. Or do they mean that the State at least should do nothing to methodise the disjointed efforts of individuals? In that case they will have to show that the State—that is, the collective nation—has no interest in the matter. What would be the consequence, if wars were carried on upon the voluntary system, and military evolutions left to the private judg-

ment of the soldiers, the general merely supplying them with details of information, but abstaining from all officious interference on such subjects as arms, ammunition, discipline, and a commissariat? In that case we suspect that many an incident would occur at least as eccentric as the one with which Aristophanes amused his good-humoured audience—that of a loquacious Athenian faring forth with all his family to a hostile camp, resolved to contract for a separate peace on behalf of himself, his wife, his maid-servant, and one child. Pauperism, meanwhile, is inexorable, and will grant neither peace nor further truce. And Colonization requires the aid of the State, — because those who are worst off in their own country can least afford the cost of leaving it; because duly to assist them implies a combination not only of all the classes interested, but of agencies at the remotest extremities of the world; and because the work, if undone, will compromise the prosperity, certainly of the parent country, perhaps also of the colony; or, if ill done, can turn out to be nothing to the parent country but a scandal, and to the colony but a curse.

Or is the objection less to the systematic aid of the State, than to Colonization itself, from its being an undertaking not likely 'to pay?' Those who are averse to it on such grounds in the face of all experience, and in spite of our colonial and American trade, would maintain the like paradox, although Canada lay as near to our shores as the Isle of Man. The sea, be it remembered, whether broad or narrow, is no longer a barrier but a high road; and to cross it is far easier than to travel from the eastern to the western states of America. Why, then, should emigration be an unprofitable enterprise, or one profitable only if undertaken at random and by the desultory exertions of individuals? We can afford to spend some three hundred millions upon railroads not expected to prove extraordinarily productive. Why, then, should mere distance be such an obstacle that, although to embank the Wash or to reclaim the bog of Allen be thought no impossible achievement, it should yet be impracticable to fell the woods of New Brunswick, and to cultivate some of the richest tracts in the world,—except through the unassisted labours of isolated individuals? We are able to spend six or seven millions a year in the shape of a poor-rate; and, as is generally supposed, about as much more in private charity. If, to this, we add nearly another annual million spent on our criminal and convict establishments, the sums which we actually pay for pauperism, and for that crime which pauperism, more than all other causes, engenders, represent no inconsiderable yearly revenue. Were we to add to these sums the

other, and perhaps greater, losses indirectly connected with over-population,—the loss resulting from idleness, from insecurity, from false competition, and above all from depraved habits and energies sapped, misapplied, or suppressed for want of a field; were we able to add all these minus quantities together, and embody them in one arithmetical expression, it would assuredly appear that tasks, not unworthy of State interference, still remain among us unperformed; and that the nation is already subject to expenses somewhat less reproductive than an enterprise which would convert her paupers into customers.

Colonization involves in it no mysterious difficulty, though it requires much individual, and some concentrated, energy; unless indeed it can be shown that obstacles, unknown in earlier times, are opposed to it by our modern improvements in agriculture, navigation, and trade. But for Colonization the human race, instead of replenishing the earth and subduing it, would, at this moment, be confined to a few tribes cultivating astronomy and Semitic recollections by the banks of the Ganges or 'that great river Euphrates.' Considered economically, Colonization means the transference of labour and of capital to those fresh regions in which, while each is the helpmate not the rival of the other, both have their amplest rewards. In an old country, the competition of labourers may reduce every one to the condition of a white slave, without the usual comforts possessed by the better class of slaves: nay, free trade itself may practically amount to little more than free trade in slave labour. In a new country, the more the labour that is expended the larger is its return, to employer and employed. In an old country, the competition of capitalists so reduces gains, or, as it is technically called, produces the 'tendency of profits to a minimum,' that, in the opinion of many economists, an actual destruction of capital, through the failure of such speculations as low profits compel men to embark in, is necessary, from time to time, in order to unclog the wheels of trade. Under such circumstances, a nation would surely not be unwise, which should employ some of this superfluous capital in opening out inexhaustible fields for the productive employment of the rest. It is a question of common sense. Capital and a virgin soil have as much affinity with each other, as fire has with tinder or appetite with food; and, with all due respect to the class of romance-writers whose art, from the time of old Longus, has been chiefly shown in keeping up a perpetual mistification between lovers, we cannot but believe that things mutually correlative, if fairly brought together, will be able to come to a mutual understanding. If on this great question there exist any just cause for

doubt, that doubt is not whether systematic Colonization be a practicable thing, or whether England possesses the powers of carrying it into effect, but whether she will exercise her powers, and exercise them in time. No one questions that it is the intention of Providence that every serviceable part of the globe should be the dwelling-place of man; and as little reason is there for believing that such a design is to be accomplished only through irruptions of horde displacing horde, or the random efforts of refugees flying from starvation. Among other grave, reasonable, and heroic works, Colonization is reserved especially for those nations which have approved themselves worthy of transmitting their names and institutions entwined with the future hopes of man. It is through the noblest nations that nature extends the race; as it is for the most part through the soundest individual constitutions that she perpetuates it. The wealth of England alone could never have summoned her to so high an office. The hardihood, the enterprise, and the perseverance which have imparted to her that wealth, and many a better gift,—it is these things that lay upon her the duty of devoting each of her talents to its most exalted office. It is not for nothing that to England has been committed the sway of an empire on which the sun never sets, at that precise period at which scientific discoveries have won their latest triumphs over space and time; and at which the pressure of population creates an uneasiness at home, perilous at all times, but most perilous when popular influences and public opinion have acquired the ascendancy they now possess. What hardship is it, if that strong Anglo-Saxon race which has vanquished the asperities of the severest climates, and breasted a kindly or adverse fortune on the remotest shores, be called upon at once to fill up the measure of its peaceful victories, and to reap the full benefit of its past trials? In England the largest experience is now united with the largest powers and the largest empire. Every past error is a lesson of incalculable worth; and every effort to realise a more scientific method of Colonization has been attended with the happiest results. It is by successive trials only that great lessons are perfectly learned. ‘Ride on,’ says the Psalmist, ‘and thy right hand shall teach thee.’ It is a noble work to plant the foot of England and extend her sceptre by the banks of streams unnamed, and over regions yet unknown,—and to conquer, not by the tyrannous subjugation of inferior races, but by the victories of mind over brute matter and blind mechanic obstacles. A yet nobler work it is to diffuse over a new created world the laws of Alfred, the language of Shakspeare, and that Christian religion, the last



great heritage of man. But the most elevated duties are the most exacting; and nations which prove not equal to their highest privileges, strive in vain to keep their humblest franchises. 'Confugiendum est ad Imperium!' The consummation of our Colonial Empire is necessary for our domestic peace.

ART. II.—1: *Observations on the Necessity of adopting Legislative Measures to diminish the Recurrence of Fatal Accidents in Collieries, and to prolong the Duration of the Coal Mines of the Kingdom.* By W. CHAPMAN, Civil Engineer. 1815.

2. *The National Importance of preserving Mining Records.* By T. SOPWITH, F.G.S. 1844.

3. *A Bill for establishing District Registers of all Mines and Mining Operations in England and Wales.* Printed by Order of the House of Commons, Aug. 1844.

GREAT BRITAIN is indebted to its Mines for its colonization in the mists of time,—for much of its present importance,—and, according to Bochart and others, even for its very name. Its whole history indeed is associated with these subterranean treasures. The most ancient nations of the East resorted to it for tin and copper. Julius Cæsar, like the Spanish conquerors of the West, was attracted to its shores chiefly by rumours of its mineral wealth: And Pliny, and even the severer Tacitus, invested Britain with the splendours of an El Dorado. These golden visions, to be sure, were not realised. But the Romans worked extensively its mines of lead, and extracted silver from the produce. It was reserved for much later times to discover that the stratification of Britain was of almost unequalled variety, and that it contained, to an extent never dreamed of, the most abundant supplies of coal and iron. The manufacturing industry of the North originated in, and was long satisfied with, the power derived from the uncertain streams issuing from its mountains. But the Steam Engine at last opened out visions of national wealth more gorgeous than the mines of Peru. It not only enabled the deeper metallic and other mines to be worked, and thus added new realms of happy conquest to the nation, but it formed in itself a matchless power for all the industrial arts of life. All that this many-handed and munificent giant demanded for its unceasing labours, was a sufficient supply of its peculiar food: and fortunately for Britain, this food was found within her shores in a profusion and of an excellence unparalleled in Europe.

The present importance of British mining will appear by the

following brief statement:—193,000 persons are actually employed in the mines, and 142,000 more in the strictly metallic arts and manufactures. The entire population depending on mining was, in 1801, 894,212, in 1841, 799,918: and now probably little short of a million. The annual profit rated to the Income Tax was, in 1801, 2,000,000*l.*, in 1841, 3,600,000*l.*\*; and now certainly above 4,000,000*l.* The yearly produce of copper is about 15,000 tons, of lead, 50,000 tons, and of tin, 5000 tons. It is difficult to estimate the enormous produce of iron. Mr. Porter, in his 'Progress of the Nation,' states it at 1,250,000 tons; and in 1846 we find it estimated at 2,200,000. With respect to coal, it was calculated that, in 1835, the produce was 24,000,000 tons: and there can be no doubt that it has since prodigiously increased; in consequence, particularly, of the vast enlargement of our iron manufactures. Mr. Taylor, as stated in our last October Number, estimated, it in 1846, at no less than 34,754,750.

The total annual produce of British mines was valued long ago at 25,000,000*l.*†: and it is now some years since an eminent foreign writer calculated that the subterraneous wealth of Great Britain (including, we should suppose, lime, marl, stone, brick-clay, and every other terrene substance) was scarcely less than that which was yielded by its surface! and we remember that at the time one of our first native authorities upon such a subject observed, that the *data* upon which this calculation had proceeded were correct, as far as he was acquainted with them.

These vast operations are highly gratifying, no doubt, to our national feelings. But their very magnitude tends to create apprehension for their duration. It may be true that in metallic mining there are still great unexplored fields; and that the iron regions, in particular, are hardly yet fully known. But the experience of late years has amply shown that the duration formerly assigned for that most important of all our national minerals—coal, must now be much abridged, by its prodigiously increased consumption. Into this question, which has been

\* Spackman's Analysis of the Occupations of the People.

† In 1837 M. Verlet formed the following comparative table of the mining produce of Europe:—

Great Britain	-	-	-	1	Hartz	-	-	-	1
Russia and Poland	-	-	-	2	Tuscany	-	-	-	3
France	-	-	-	4	Bavaria	-	-	-	3
Austria	-	-	-	13	Saxony	-	-	-	3
Spain	-	-	-	1	Piedmont and Savoy	-	-	-	3
Prussia	-	-	-	1	Denmark	-	-	-	4
Sweden	-	-	-	1	Norway	-	-	-	3
				19					

much discussed since the parliamentary inquiry of 1829, we cannot now enter. But the quantity of available coal has certainly been much exaggerated; and the yearly demand for it is still more certainly increasing to an extent not dreamed of by those who, not long ago, assigned so many ages for its endurance. Already some of the best seams of coal are becoming extinct. In the region of the Tyne, this has been accomplished in the brief space of seventy years: and ere long it must also occur in the fine districts of the Wear and the Tees: and though it is calculated that there are still not less than 12,000 square miles of good workable coal in Great Britain and Ireland, we cannot but feel that the prophecy of Mr. Bakewell, who examined the question with great care,—that ‘we may anticipate a period *not very remote* when all the English mines of coal and ironstone will be exhausted,’—is now much nearer completion than he himself could see, in a day of far less activity and enterprise. But, indepen-

---

\*. We have a confident hope, however, — or rather a firm belief — that, long before our coal-fields are thus really exhausted, discoveries will be made, both of new *Motive powers* and new *sources of Heat* or Caloric, which will make all future generations independent of these clumsy and dingy resources. Motive power, we think, will probably be supplied, either directly by such omnipresent and inexhaustible elements as Electricity and Galvanism, or by the employment of some gas, far more elastic than steam, and capable of being called into action, and again condensed, by slight mechanical impulses, or by changes of temperature incalculably less than are now necessary for the management of that comparatively intractable substance. But, even if we should still require to use steam, we are persuaded that means will be devised for its generation, — or rather for the production or evolution of Heat for that and all other purposes, — far less operose, indirect and precarious, than the combustion of coal. This may probably be effected, without any process of combustion at all, either by the great agents of galvanism or electricity already referred to; or by the friction, hammering, or rolling, of solid and practically indestructible bodies; or by the forcible compression of common air, or of other elastic fluids; or by the chemical combination of different substances; while, if combustion must still be resorted to, might it not be constantly maintained without the tremendous expense of the working and transportation of fuel, by merely contriving a method of burning the inexhaustible, omnipresent, and eternally reproduced element of *hydrogen*, as it exists in the great ocean, and in all our lakes, rivers, fountains, and tanks and tubs of rain water, with the equally omnipresent, inexhaustible, and constantly reproduced *oxygen* of the circumambient atmosphere?

These, we are aware, may now strike many (perhaps most) people as mere Utopian or Laputan fancies. And undoubtedly they are, as yet, but vague and general suggestions. But when we consider how

dently of the question of exhaustion, there are abundant reasons, as will presently appear, for drawing the serious attention of the legislature to the present condition of the British mines.

Of all the regulations relating to mining, the most obvious certainly seems to be that of preserving a precise Record of the discoveries and operations actually effected. If the minerals of Britain were gathered from the visible surface, like the diamonds of Brazil or the gold of California, or were quarried, like freestone, from the open rock, such a provision might be unnecessary. But in vast works, carried on at immense depths, never penetrated by the light of day, where each field of labour is liable to many fluctuating periods of decay, and desertion, and active prosecution—to unseen encroachments of dangerous elements, and treacherous neighbours—such an omission in such vast and vital concerns, and in such an age, may well create surprise. But it is nevertheless true, that there is no British mine, be it deep or shallow, of which the operations are so recorded as to be certainly and safely depended upon, for the guidance of the future adventurer, after the lapse of a few years.

There are some reasons and some apologies no doubt for this neglect. In many continental countries there is a very rigid system of registration.\* But, with few exceptions, all the mines

much wilder and more audacious (as less warranted by any analogous experience) similar anticipations of Electric Telegraphs, Photographic painting, or Railway locomotives must have appeared but fifty years ago, we really cannot consent to put them into such a category; but, on the contrary, confess to a certain feeling, both of pride and of confidence, in thus recording what we cannot but consider as a truly Prophetic, though it may be but a dim and somewhat indistinct, vision of a good and a glory to come.

It is not necessary, however, for our escape from the evils we anticipate, that all these discoveries should be made before our own paltry twelve thousand square miles of coal are actually dug out and consumed; since we know that, independent of other sources, there are, within the territories of the United States alone, not less than one hundred and thirty-five thousand square miles of the same precious mineral! for the *exploitation* and easy transport of which—to our shores and to all the shores of the world,—we doubt not that vast and yet unimagined facilities will be found, before we suffer much from the failure of our home resources.

\* In Prussia the mining companies are compelled, by the terms of their grant, to provide two copies of exact plans; one of which is placed in the custody of the Government, in the archives of the Court of Mines. These plans are most carefully prepared by sworn surveyors, upon a scale of  $\frac{1}{10000}$ th of the actual dimensions, and are brought up to the actual state of the works, once or even twice in

of those countries belong to the State; which works them either by means of a distinct official department, or of proprietors whose interests are precisely defined. A system of records has thus been rendered absolutely necessary, for the protection as well of the State as of the different claimants under it, and for the prevention of disputes. But by the law of England, all its mines, except those which in fact do not exist — those of gold and silver — belong to manorial or other proprietors of the soil. The State has consequently been excluded from superintendence; and the unfettered management of all mining property has devolved upon a very large and unconnected body of private owners. In the early times of mining, when the veins were all worked near the surface, and on the small scale still apparent in the existing local customs of Derbyshire and Cornwall, no great national necessity called for direct control. But in the gigantic and deep works of the last half century, and in the recent enormous extension of all mining operations, it soon became evident that the want of a national system required to be remedied by private arrangements. Many enlightened proprietors have

---

every year. In all important cases a third record is kept in the provincial mining courts. In metallic mines the plans consist of ground plans, separate for each vein; two horizontal sections, to show the relative position of the bearing lines of the veins at different depths; and three vertical sections for the shafts and levels. The latter sections are often larger than  $\frac{1}{3200}$ th, — when it is wished to represent great disturbances. In each coal-field there is a general map, with proper references to each seam, of which there is also a separate map. There is also a plan of the surface, on a scale of  $\frac{1}{4000}$ th, with references to the works below. In the general maps there is recorded various information with respect to outcrops and denudations. Besides all this, there is a distinct *monthly* or *quarterly* register of mining events, preserved in the central and provincial courts. ‘These form,’ says the present highly intelligent director, Herr von Deeken, ‘a continuous history of each mine; and by them and the plans can be made out *every circumstance which may be of importance in future times*. Of the accidents which occur in the mines by inflammable gas, or by the irruption of water, or in any other way, there are also kept separate records, — in which the state of the mines, and the causes of the accidents, are mentioned in the *minutest detail*.’

In Austria there is a similar system; combined with a most admirable course of mining instruction for those destined to that employment. In Belgium there are maps, made under the direction of Government; which describe the position and extent of every coal, iron, and other mine in the country. The most minute information of the state of the mines, and of the accidents, are thus communicated and preserved.

accordingly sought to procure proper plans of their mines, distinct from those used for carrying on the daily operations. Lords of extensive manors have in some instances insisted, in their leases, that the lessees should from time to time deliver in accurate plans, to be registered among the muniments of the manor. If such a system could be made universal in mining districts, and were well conducted, it would leave little to be desired: and would indeed be, perhaps, the most perfect form of registration — since such registers would be easily accessible, both for periodical additions, and corrections, and also for constant inspection. But very few proprietors have adopted any part of so obvious and so advantageous a system; and fewer still a system which is at all adequate for its purposes. The plans and sections are mostly very meagre; are badly executed, and founded upon surveys either wholly incorrect or on which no dependence can be placed. The most inveterate inertness and the most incredible want of foresight and common prudence, mingled with foolish and unhappy prejudices, too often prevent any such scheme being thought of, much less matured. The proprietors of extensive mining fields and their agents are too often contented to pursue the beaten track, and are insensible to the fact that a more enlightened system would at once secure a better profit, and conduce to the proper working of the mines. On the other hand, there is no sufficient motive for exertion in a body of lessees who are constantly changing; and who at best have but a limited interest in their mines. In those numerous mines which are carried on upon the most grudging scale of outlay, and upon no other principle than that of extracting the largest immediate profit without regard to future prospects, the plans are either worse than useless, or they do not exist at all.

In our coal and iron mines a system of manorial registration could never become general. Coal-fields do not usually lie in this country under great mountain wastes, where the entire surface is owned by some ancient house, or some fortunate possessor of a feudal domain. They lie, for the most part, under rich plains and valleys, the surface of which is divided among numerous proprietors, who, in most instances, have corresponding rights over the minerals below. The consequence is, therefore, a great — often a very minute — subdivision of mineral territories. In such cases there can never be a system of records founded upon the rights of proprietorship. Even in the few cases which might appear eminently favourable for the adoption of some such plan, no anxiety on this subject has yet been exhibited. For instance, the Dean and Chapter of Durham and the Bishop of Durham,

who are possessed of very extensive mineral tracts of coal, iron, and lead, preserve in their archives no documents which may show to future ages the extent to which the inheritance of the Church may have been unjustly despoiled.

It might have been supposed that this very subdivision would in itself have lent a great impulse to the formation of proper records. The actual or the anticipated interference of the works of one proprietor with those of another, are events of daily occurrence: and in an old mining country parties are driven to measures of caution by daily and urgent necessity. But in more recent mines, the greatest possible negligence prevails. The works are consequently carried on, not only without regard to future consequences to other proprietors, but in the most wasteful and reckless manner, as regards the present owners themselves. In many concerns, particularly in the Midland Counties, it is notorious that no plans at all are ever prepared. What wonder then if there are, in all such cases, improvident and premature exhaustion, future embarrassments, numerous and fatal accidents, and the wilful sacrifice of immense national resources!

In the well-known coal-fields of Northumberland and Durham, there is certainly no such negligence as this; yet it cannot be said that even the best records of that district disclose all the information which might be expected with reference to so important a subject. But if these records were ever so perfect, there are no existing means by which they can be preserved, and made practically useful either to the present or any future generation. They may indeed be carefully consulted during the existence of a partnership, or the continuance of an adventure. The time, however, comes when the adventure is terminated, either by the exhaustion of the principal coal seam, or by some premature abandonment. The plans and sections belong of course to the late owners, who are either dispersed, and their papers with them, or cease to take any interest in the records of past failures or exhaustions. The lessors of the minerals again, whose leases contain in general no stipulation of that nature, cannot demand the deposit with them of correct plans, or may never contemplate the commencement of a gigantic enterprise which might be required for further and future prosecution of the works,—or are too short-sighted to perceive that the day may sooner or later arrive, when the records of their mines would be more precious than their weight in gold. And even if copies of any of them should chance to be preserved by any of these lessors or lessees, their continued preservation cannot at all be depended on for any length of time. Men will not interest themselves in the care of documents to which they have ceased to attach import-

ance. There is, however, one class of men who, in the midst of this general neglect, take a just interest in these documents, — the agents who have been employed in the winning or working of the mine. By these gentlemen they are indeed generally preserved; both from a natural desire to retain the records of proceedings in which they have been personally occupied, and also from a just feeling that an accurate knowledge of their contents tends to enlarge their professional experience and authority in the district, — and may at some period confer the most direct and beneficial assistance in the scene of former labours. By many such persons, accordingly, these records are often preserved with scrupulous care; and indeed sometimes with so jealous a caution as to render them of little practical service. But even in such cases there is no security for their permanent preservation. They are always liable to destruction, by the hands of the possessor himself, — by his caprice or his neglect, or much more frequently, from some interest he has, or fancies he has, in their entire suppression. He may, for various reasons, both proper and improper, wish that these records should die with himself. If, however, they are destined to survive, they may fall into the hands of those who take no interest in them; of executors who forget their existence, wealthy heirs who may throw them into the fire as useless reminiscences of dreary labours, or too thrifty housekeepers. It is well known to those conversant with the subject, how many of these invaluable documents are now silently subject to a lingering decay, or to rapid destruction, — that the plans of sixty years ago, in short, are for the most part already irrecoverably lost, — that every passing year must add to this irreparable ruin, and that the day will infallibly come when their loss will be made memorable by most deplorable disasters.

Let us now consider the effects of the present condition of mining records.

The most calamitous result is that which involves the loss of human life. That accidents fatal to limb and life must ever occur in mining, is certain. They are incident to a pursuit carried on amidst dangers, darkness, and difficulties. They are also too frequently incurred by the hardihood or the gross carelessness of the operatives themselves. But it is not less certain that many of those astounding catastrophes, which from time to time overwhelm a country village with the deepest distress, fill a whole district with gloom, and even excite for a brief hour the wonder and sympathies of the nation, might be prevented by the adoption of proper precautions. In this point of view, a most stupendous responsibility rests upon the several



parties, on whom the management of mines liable to accident in any degree depends.

One of the greatest sources of such accidents is water. In those metalliferous mines which are found in veins they are less frequent, for obvious reasons. But even mines of this description are worked occasionally under the sea, and under the beds of rivers. A copper mine in Cornwall was long worked by a shaft sunk in the very bed of the ocean; and a valuable copper mine in North Wales is said to have been recently destroyed by the irruption of sea-water. But it is in the stratified mines of coal that this danger is most imminent: for in these the horizontal beds are of small elevation, and the works are usually surrounded by those of competitors. All the strata have a natural dip or inclination; and there are in almost every coal-field distinct beds of coal, separated at intervals from each other by intervening strata, and many of which either have been worked or are in course of working. It consequently happens that in a district generally worked, the works of an owner in the same stratum, down the line of inclination, would be, in the absence of proper precautions, constantly liable to be flooded, or *drowned* as it is termed, by any water which, by accident or design, might be left in the works above him. The mines are usually worked *to the rise*, that is, up the line of inclination: and thus the whole of the mines, which may belong to many distinct owners, would be subject to the same interference. It is the commonest of all occurrences for mines to be thus placed. In order, therefore, to avoid so tremendous a catastrophe, the utmost caution of the mine agent is habitually exercised. His vigilance on this point must never sleep. In all well regulated mines so situated, a large and sufficient portion of the coal itself is left unworked, for a protection: or the most massive and enduring artificial barriers are, in isolated breaches, interposed to prevent all encroachments of the hostile fluid. In this manner, *and by means of correct plans and descriptions of the works*, the danger may be effectively prevented. But if these records are not correct, and if the works of those above are inadvertently or improperly extended into the mineral which has been left for a barrier, or if the barrier left is in any way insufficient, in all these cases the most fatal consequences may immediately ensue. Now it is notorious that the most inadequate barriers are frequently thus left. Those owners who first arrive at any boundary, whether working to the dip or the rise, seldom think of such a precaution. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. If the coal is very valuable, as in the main seams, they are only anxious to extract as much as is possible, with far too little regard to con-

sequences. In many of the old districts there are, in fact, no barriers at all. It is well known that *there is no barrier on either side of the river Tyne which can be at all depended upon.* No attention is there paid to barriers, and no dependence is in fact placed upon them. There are at least ten working collieries in the vicinity just alluded to, all worked in the same seam, and through which the water may fall in succession, for many miles from Gateshead Fell. In such cases, it is in the option of the owners below, either to allow their mines to be flooded at the risk of abandonment, or to enter into a joint, and often expensive, contribution for the proper drainage of the water above them all. Under such an arrangement, and *as long as it endures*, all may be safe. But the case is very different where such contracts have come to an end, or never existed. As long as the mine above is worked, and the water is properly drained from it, the damage is averted. But the mine is in process of time abandoned, and its records perish. The water ceases to be drained, and accumulates in one vast basin, extending in its area for many acres, and filling up the whole extent of excavations. The growing pressure of such a body of water upon the beds or barriers below becomes enormous; and then the water, testing every weak point of the body opposed to its escape, at length, in some unexpected moment of supposed security, invades, with resistless fury the regions left exposed to its violence. All the works below are completely filled; and the mines are for a time, it may be for ever, surrendered to the destructive element.

In the vicinity of *old wastes*, or ancient workings, this danger is most formidable, because it can be least obviated. Ruin may lurk in any corner. The next stroke of the pickaxe in the new workings may bring down utter devastation. These wastes, of course, daily increase. Thousands of pounds would be freely given at this moment, by many owners, for a knowledge of the old works, of which there is no plan on record: and which no memory can now recall. In 1815 the celebrated accident at Heaton, near Newcastle-on-Tyne, occurred, in which ninety lives were lost. The water flowed from two adjoining old collieries; which had been abandoned seventy years before. There were no plans. It was known, however, generally, that old works were at hand; and proper precautions were thought to have been adopted. The exploring drifts were subjected to the process of boring for several years. A barrier of six feet withstood a pressure of thirty fathoms of water. But an irruption was aided at last by a natural fissure of the rock; and the catastrophe followed before any adequate protection could be interposed. And this is no isolated instance. A hundred similar

accidents might be enumerated. At Wigan the river Douglas rushed into the works. At Workington the Irish Channel was the agent. Not long ago a tremendous calamity of the same nature, after an outlay of 100,000*l.*, totally ruined the Baghillt coal mines in Wales. The water came from old adjoining mines which had been abandoned. Many of these accidents are also attended with expensive litigation. In the districts where no plans or records are kept, such occurrences must, of course, be most common: And that they are very common, is apparent from the cases which are almost weekly reported in the ordinary journals.

These accidents are often attended with a great sacrifice of human life. But there are other results which, although not to be compared with the loss of life, are yet more injurious to the interests of mining. There is always an immense sacrifice of property and capital. The whole mine is thrown into confusion. The perishable articles are all destroyed: and those of a more enduring nature are greatly injured. The mine may be rendered dangerous in various ways; as by the destruction of its supporting timbers, or the damage done to temporary or permanent barriers. All these injuries demand fresh outlays of capital. Again, it may be a most difficult and costly task to recover the mine by freeing it from water: And in many instances the attempt has to be given up as hopeless: as in the disgraceful disasters of Workington and Landshipping in Pembroke. Mrs. Partington would have been as well employed in mopping out the German Ocean—or the dogs of *Æsop* in lapping up the river to get at the meat. In more ordinary cases it becomes a question of serious consideration for owners, who, as now too frequently happens, are making small profits, or whose interest may be about to expire, whether they would be justified in incurring any great expenditure for such a purpose at all.

‘*Quod si tantus amor menti, si tanta cupido est,  
Bis Stygios innare lacus, bis nigra videre  
Tartara; et insano juvat indulgere labori,  
Accipe quæ peragenda prius.*’

The cost may be enormous: in one case, we know that it was 50,000*l.* It is often equal to the expense of a new winning; and, in fact, such a course is often preferred. If the mine is abandoned, the owners of course conclude an unlucky adventure, — though they may still be liable for many years to the payment of a large certain rent to the lessors. There is a loss to the nation, perhaps for ever, of immense masses of coal. It may indeed be afterwards reserved for adventurers of bolder hearts and prouder purses to incur the cost and reopen the workings: But

these, in their turn, may perhaps find that, for want of proper records of the past, their labours are rewarded, like the career of many conquerors, with much success, but with little fruit. They are too likely to resemble the hero whose father was ruined by gaining a Chancery suit. If, however, the mine is ultimately freed from water by the requisite outlay, there are still the inconveniences and discouragements of a great interruption in business. The owners fail in the performance of their contracts, and consequently lose a portion of their customers; and it is possible that the whole mining property will have been depreciated in the market, by reasonable or unreasonable suspicions of its continued liability to such serious accidents. In addition to all this, it must often happen, as a crowning evil, that the owners may either involve themselves, or be involved by others, in a cheerless course of legal proceedings with respect to the injury they have sustained—or are unjustly charged with inflicting upon their fellow sufferers in the works below them.

Upon that infinitely more terrific cause of awful accidents—the explosive gas, we have not now space to enter.\* But among the advantages to be anticipated from an authentic system of mining records, may fairly be included the collection and careful examination of the various facts and phenomena connected with the subject of explosions, and other sources of accidents. The very record of such events, and the formation of proper plans, would tend to generate both caution and inquiry. In this manner it is not too much to expect that time and science may yet develop some means of finally subduing even this most dreaded, most subtle, and most powerful enemy; and that the miner may, at length, tread the floor of his dusky abode as securely as the husbandman the harvest fields of the surface.

A system of registration would, in the next place, insure to the owners of all descriptions of mines a greater freedom from interference by improper workings out of bounds. That such mistakes or malpractices take place in all mining districts which contain a number of competitors, is but too well known. In the coal-fields the ownership of which is much subdivided, they are very frequent. One of the most eminent coal-viewers of the North recently abstracted, in this manner, the coal of other owners to the amount of thousands of pounds, the greater part of which was never recovered. But such encroachments occur

---

\* The number of fatal accidents in mines, as well as the general premature mortality, are much exaggerated; but accidents have become, of late years, more frequent and more fatal, and most proprietors are convinced of the necessity of legislative interference.

in all districts of the realm, and have given rise to much vexatious litigation.

In all those mines which are worked nearly to their limits, but especially in those of small extent, even where plans have been preserved, it may easily happen that this wrongful abstraction may take place from mere inadvertence, or, at any rate, from an error founded upon an imperfect record. In metallic mines such an error may easily arise in the most innocent manner. In such cases it is obvious that a more correct system of plans, and a higher motive for correctness, should be furnished than exist at present. If the trespass arose from an error, it would be rectified at the next period of registration; or, at any rate, it would be liable to detection by those concerned in discovering it. In coal mines the matter would depend upon accurate measurements, made with reference to the surface, which could easily be put to the proof. In metalliferous mines, a simple, honest inspection of a correct plan would instantly discover all serious errors; and the simple identifying of a vein, or the direction of its bearing, or the manner of its ramifications, might at once prevent future calamities, and crush in the bud a long course of anxious, and expensive litigation. Any extensive miner will readily bear witness to this. A question of the kind, indeed, has just been terminated in Cumberland, after a litigation of nearly twenty years, and involving property to the amount of nearly 50,000*l.*, which might have been most decisively adjusted, at the first step of the dispute, by an accurate system of records. In those numerous districts where no plans whatever are kept, the evil is aggravated to a fearful extent.

But, if the dangers arising from simple mistakes are thus manifest, what are they compared to those which arise from deliberate fraud? When, in these dim regions, a proprietor is disposed to commit a wrongful trespass, there often is no impediment to his designs. It is certain there is the greatest temptation. No access is permitted to strangers. In some cases the Court of Chancery might probably compel inspection; but, if it were allowed, the inspectors would often be unable, from a mere cursory survey, to form any idea of what was going on. The workmen act in obedience to orders which they do not comprehend: so that the truth could never be got from them. The injury, too, may often be undiscovered till all remedy is gone; and, if a remedy be sought, the very imperfection of the plans that are kept may be plausibly alleged to excuse an undoubted fraud. It is well known how extremely difficult in legal proceedings it is to *prove*, against known wrongdoers, that there was the intention to defraud. They plead ignorance and mistake. The

imputation of gross fraud may be, to all disinterested minds, as clear as the light of day; but it may be incapable, notwithstanding, of legal proof. There are also other difficulties of evidence. In coal mines the mere fact of working out of assigned bounds is easily proved: but in mines which are worked in veins, granted for a certain length, the commission of fraud is vastly aided by the power of the wrongdoers in possession to conceal traces of veins in one part, or to develope or forge traces of different veins in other parts, and, by numberless devices, wholly to misrepresent the real state of affairs. In some of these instances, when the veins are rich in solid ore, and which are precisely the occasions to tempt men from the line of duty, the injury may amount rapidly to thousands of pounds. In like manner, what wealth may exist in a few feet of coal extending along some long line of boundary! Thousands of pounds are constantly claimed for such proceedings. This evil is increasing every day: the increase is visible in the records of our courts of law, where they were formerly comparatively rare. But by far the greatest number of these injuries never reaches the eye or ear of the public. They lurk in the offices of the solicitor or in the chambers of counsel. Some are too gross to be denied, and are hushed up by compromise or arbitration. The same private tribunal is resorted to in most disputed claims; and a large portion is unfortunately deprived of all remedy whatever.

This absence of remedy proceeds to a great extent, from the construction put upon the Statute of Limitations. All *land* may be recovered from a wrongful owner within a period of twenty years: And both coal and ore are held to constitute land, while in the state in which Nature has placed them. But, when the mineral is once severed from its native bed, it instantly loses, in the contemplation of law, all its qualities of land, and becomes a personal substance. The remedy becomes, therefore, a personal, not a real, action; and it must be brought against the delinquent trespasser, within six years! But this is not all: the mode of computing the period in question is one of peculiar hardship in the case of mines. For the six years begin to run, not from the time when the injury was first discovered, or even fairly capable of discovery; but from the time when it was actually committed. This point of law may be founded upon a very proper construction of the Statute of Limitations; and it may—in the history of human transactions, which are conducted in the face of day and may be read and seen by all interested in discovering an injury—be a very proper provision. But it must be obvious that, in mining pursuits, this unbending rule of law must often produce gross injustice. Such a rule should

not, for a moment, be suffered in any civilised country — unless the legislation of that country counteracted its evil by adopting along with it a system of management, which would at once and at any time disclose the real truth. It is true that, by way of apparent compensation, the law visits these offences, in one respect, with unusual severity. Several recent decisions have established that, in the legal redress of these grievances, the wrongdoer can claim no compensation for the costs of opening out or working the mineral he has wrongfully abstracted. The measure of damages is the market value of the mineral at the instant of severance, and not the mere profits derived from its sale. The difference is always great, and it may be immense: But this rule gives no aid to the demand of him who unhappily comes too late. The offence detected in time is indeed punished heavily; but that which has not and could not have been detected within the limited period, escapes with impunity. This is no just measure of law. The law should either afford its remedy in all cases when the offence has been recently discovered, or it ought, on the commonest principles of justice, to afford the complainant *the means of discovering* whether or not he is wronged and robbed of his property. At present, however, the statute affords a complete immunity to those who commit wrong, supposing that they can only contrive to suppress the knowledge of that wrong for a few years: And this is commonly no difficult task in mining affairs. The truth may lurk in the solitary soul of some shrinking agent, or may be secured under the seal of professional secrecy; and it may never be disclosed till the offender is gathered to a grave of wrong if not of infamy, and all the participators of his frauds or his plunder, both witting and unwitting, are protected by the undistinguishing shield of the law. If the offence should be dragged to light in after days, the dishonest escape without being called upon for compensation, or for even a syllable of excuse; or they seek refuge in some weak plea of justification which may impose upon the world. Nay, such pleas, we fear, are often taken by those who are esteemed honourable and respectable, on their proposing moderate conditions of settlement. These conditions they know, at all events, cannot be effectually questioned: and accordingly there is little difficulty in the negotiation. The injured are like the poor philosopher, who, disputing with the emperor Hadrian, found it impossible to convince a man who commanded thirty legions. It is true, that a Court of Equity, acting upon broader principles than Courts of Law, would not permit the Statute of Limitations to be pleaded in defence of acts founded on *manifest fraud*, nor, perhaps, in some

peculiar cases of mistake. But it has been already seen with what difficulty fraud can be detected; and what various devices, easily propounded, and difficult to be refuted by those ignorant of the circumstances, may be resorted to, while stoutly denying the imputation. If such a fraud were indeed brought to light after the slumber of many years, the certain result would be a course of costly litigation; and the long-delayed remedy might at length be launched against those to whom it could no longer bring terror or retribution, who had, as is too usual in the history of mining, squandered the gold as easily as it was gathered, or who had, in good time, divested themselves of it, to place it in a more unapproachable position.

There is a class of persons deeply interested in mines who, without respect to the Statute of Limitations, are often most seriously defrauded under the present state of things. We allude to the lessors, or the proprietors of the land in which mines are worked. Almost all the mines of the kingdom are now worked under leases or agreements, from owners who are thus content to secure some profit and incur no loss. The stipulated payments may be properly made. But the lessor in the meantime may be entirely ignorant of the state of his mines. It is possible there was no original stipulation in the lease that he should be allowed to enter at all. And though it is now usual to reserve power for the lessor or his agents to examine the mine, it is very often not acted upon, from feelings of confidence or a foolish fear of expense or trouble. At any rate the works are, of course, under the control of the lessees; and admit of being represented, even to a professional observer, in very false colours. The mine, if of coal or iron, may be improvidently worked, or, as is more common, may be stated to be in an exhausted state; and if worked in veins, it may be plausibly, though falsely stated, that the vein has been impoverished, by former labours, or has become poor through the instrumentality of Nature, or has been utterly lost or extinguished. Every person conversant with mining knows how easily these assertions can be made, and *shown by apparent proofs*—and how difficult it often will be to expose their falsehood. All these statements may be confirmed, too, by concerted accounts of the produce—and a retrenched establishment. The lease, in such circumstances, is generally about to be renewed—and easier terms must be given by the lessor: while most certainly it is often found that a season of great and most unaccountable prosperity occurs after this mournful depression—and *after the renewal of the lease!*

But there are still more striking grievances than these. In the present state of things there is likely to be, in a still severer form, if no timely remedy be applied, an immense waste of



capital embarked in mines, arising from an ignorance of previous operations. All mines, under all conditions, and in all systems of rocks, are liable to be abandoned. The abandonment may be entire, or it may be partial; that is, distinct parts of a mine may be deserted. This is not only a frequent, but it is a universal occurrence in all mines of any extent. It is a natural result of mining. The deserted portions of every mine speedily fall into a very dilapidated condition. In those metallic mines, worked in hard unstratified rock, which affords a solid roof and a sound floor, the main adits and passages are of a character which may be expected to continue open for a length of time; and it has of late years been justly required on the part of lessors that these excavations should not be filled up, as formerly occurred too often, with earth and fragments extracted from other parts of the mine. But there is a constant breach of covenants in these particulars on the part of lessees, who wish to save themselves the expense of bringing the mine refuse to the surface; and in the course of time the lesser workings and even the main levels become either very difficult and dangerous of access, or wholly unapproachable. But in those mines, whether of coal or metal, which are worked in the carboniferous or stratified system, the great seat of British mining, these abandoned portions, which in their most entire state require to be supported by pillars of timber, or arches, or walls of stone, are much more subject to decay; and, except under unusual circumstances, are soon inaccessible to ordinary visits. The result in such cases, is that it becomes unknown to what extent, and in what particular places, the mining operations have been carried on.

Now, where the mine had been abandoned by reason of its complete exhaustion, a knowledge of the operations carried on in it might perhaps be dispensed with, supposing the knowledge of the simple fact could be safely relied on. It would be sufficient if future speculators were deterred from disturbing its repose. But upon what evidence, in the absence of proper records, can this fact depend? It is almost always totally incapable of proof; for a mine is abandoned for many reasons. There may have been a temporary failure or deterioration of minefal, or a fatal accident, or a want of capital or spirit, to surmount some unexpected difficulties, or an excessive cost of production, or a keen competition, or the expiration of a lease, or a protracted difference among the partners. All these are known causes of suspension merely: and therefore such a mine has always a chance of being resumed, by the same or by other persons. This resumption, too, may happen in the next month, or it may be deferred till the next century. But, unfortunately, the long abandoned workings cannot be forthwith resumed, like the labours of the surface, and continued as

if no interruption had occurred: there is in all cases a certain and inevitable amount of cost incurred in opening out the old workings, and in the new machinery and materials. In great adventures the cost of machinery alone is immense. In fact the costs often fully equal those incurred in winning a new mine. They may even be much more. For instance, the workings of the Ecton copper mine, in Staffordshire, at present abandoned, are 1650 feet deep.

Such adventurers as these of course expect to find a wealthy mine. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*. They have no records of the former works; but tradition cheers them with promises by its visions of the past. *Fortes fortuna juvat*, may be the motto: And Fortune has certainly a wide scope for her favourites in mining pursuits. But against what contingencies are these efforts made! It was known to be an abandoned mine. But the causes of abandonment were unknown. And after the anxious labours of many years, and the expenditure of a vast capital, it may be found that the cause of abandonment was the absolute exhaustion of the mineral, or the well-founded conviction that it could never afford the semblance of profit, or that the best portions had been worked, or that there was some great impediment to further progress, which neither money nor mechanical genius could overcome; or that, in fact, the mineral so eagerly sought for was never there at all!

In proper metallic mines, indeed, there is generally less likelihood of this kind of disappointment; in consequence of the great variety of veins, and the far greater uncertainty of the productiveness of veins, which may increase in value at the first stroke of the new enterprise. But the mine may after all be a perfect blank. And many other causes of failure still remain. In the lead mines of the North of England, which are in an ancient mining field, the miner is perpetually arriving at old workings. It is said on such occasions, 'The old man has been here.' This old man grows backward into the past; and very old he must have been; for there are found in such spots Roman relics and Saxon characters: and very well, too, the old man has known how to work mines for his own profit—though not according to the modern science of mining; for he has carefully abstracted the ores from the productive parts, which in his day sparkled in the roof or the sides, and has left for his successors only wretched intervals of unbroken but barren ground. This species of robbing, which was necessary before the invention of gunpowder, is well known in mining; and occasions the greatest embarrassment to the modern miner, who may be seduced by perpetual promise to efforts of perseverance. Some small leaf preserved from these olden times, would now be more

precious to him than the fabled leaves of the Sibyl. Such records should be as much prized by a nation as its Doomsday books. 'With what anxiety,' says the great practical miner and geologist, Werner, in speaking long ago of mining records, 'do we not turn over the leaves of ancient chronicles in search of information, often very obscure, imperfect, and uncertain? With what pleasure do we not receive the least sketch or plan of some ancient mine? With what pains do we not rake up the old heaps of rubbish brought out of old excavations, to discover pieces which may afford us some idea of the substances which were formerly worked out? Yet between these documents and those which we might obtain in the way pointed out, there is as much difference as between night and day.' In all old mining fields disappointments must, therefore, necessarily happen. The mines of Cornwall have been worked for more than 2000 years: And those of Derbyshire, Cumberland, and Durham certainly for 1800 years. 'The old man' may therefore be found in all regions, except in such depths as the skill of the ancients could not penetrate. And yet, even in these deepest retreats it may be reserved, after the lapse of a few years, for some future adventurers to reap a most bitter harvest. In 1824 the Wheal Alfred Mine, in Cornwall, was explored to a vast depth by the aid of three of the most powerful engines, and at a cost of 80,000*l*. The speculation failed. The mine became poorer as it became deeper, and was at last abandoned. But, a short while ago, a company was about to be organised, on a large and costly scale, for reopening that mine. Fortunately, however, the former proprietors had preserved an accurate record of their labours; and it was this record which, communicated by the kindness of a gentleman well known in the annals of modern mining, most happily prevented an enormous sacrifice of capital and many regrets, when it would have been too late. A volume might be filled with the details of actual misfortunes arising from such causes. There are many dark chapters, as well as marvellous sections in the romance of mining.

With respect to coal mines, there are additional and peculiar causes which render these experiments hazardous in the last degree. Coal mines are distinguished from others by being often subject to keen competition with adjoining mines. Excellent seams of coal are therefore often abandoned for a time, in the very process of working, till the rage of competition is spent or abated. No owners ever leave unworked a good visible vein of copper or lead. Such treasures are secured at all events. But it is not so with coal. That is often left to wait its time; either from the cause above alluded to, or from the prudent foresight of some owner who first brings the produce of

another mine into the market, and reserves the rest for future operations. But there is another still more important feature in the coal trade. In the best coal districts of the kingdom there are various seams or beds of coal, which vary in thickness, in quality, and consequently in value. These more valuable beds occur at long intervals, with inferior beds between. As a matter of course, the most accessible seams are worked first. But, from time to time the inferior beds are resorted to, either to supply some local demand, or because they are capable in certain places of even now being simultaneously and advantageously worked. A considerable amount of inferior coal is thus raised. But with the large quantity of the best, which still remains in the great coal district, the period is probably yet remote when there can be any general uniformity in the different mines. In some the good coal is exclusively worked, and the poorer is left; in others they are both worked together. The inferior seams could in general only be profitably worked at present, in connexion with the better: And many that are not so worked now, and which are deeply situated, may be utterly lost, by the time the best coal is exhausted, and the mine is abandoned. There are, however, a great many more which the exigencies of the district will at some future period infallibly require to be worked, in case their existence can be depended upon. But, if there be no record, these also will be lost to the owners and the nation. For, who will then be able to say what is left and what is gone? The more remote the period, the more dangerous the adventure. All oral memory will be extinct. *Litera scripta non manet*. A mine may therefore be reopened at a vast cost, for the express purpose of winning a known bed of coal, supposed to have been left untouched in the great speculation of former days: the renewed trial is at length crowned with apparent success, and the locality reached: when a closer investigation will possibly show the deluded adventurer that the object of his search has long since disappeared — and left the space one wide incumbent chaos. There is also another most formidable obstacle. If an upper seam of coal has been exhausted, and the space has become filled with water, the winning of the seam below, through this waste, may either be impracticable without an exacter knowledge of the solid coal which had been left for barriers or other purposes, or of the extent of the works. At any rate, the cost would be prodigiously increased, and the speculation on that account might equally prove a failure. This is the actual state in which the Low Main Seam—a valuable coal bed of the Newcastle district—is placed with respect to the High Main Seam, which is now mostly exhausted. In many spots the lower seam, called the

Beaumont Seam, though very valuable, is only approachable through vast accumulations of water, filling an extent of 2000 acres. This, indeed, is a common case in all districts, and must in future years, without the aid of records, prove a gigantic impediment to mining.

Here again may be noticed the vast importance of registration to the lessors, who are the true owners of all mines which are destined to last for ages. Of the many parties interested, the owner of a large mineral tract should treasure up with most scrupulous care the records of all metalliferous veins, as well as of the vast forces, of whatever descriptions, which disturb and disrupt his domains of coal or iron. Every lessor ought to be most intimately informed of the manner in which his mines are administered. He should bear in mind, not only that he is liable to fraud, but that his interest, and those of his lessees, are often directly opposed to each other. It is the object of every prudent lessor that the mine should be properly and judiciously worked,—that there should be no extravagant anticipations, no premature exhaustions, and no reckless and wanton waste. The lessees, on the other hand, are in general only solicitous to extract from the mine as much present profit as can be secured during the duration of their limited interest. These two objects therefore are often incompatible—and when they do come in collision, it is easy to see on whom will fall the injury. But whether the lessors, as too frequently happens, neglect this important duty or not, it should certainly be the duty of the Government to prevent the national resources of the country from being wantonly impaired or destroyed through the want of simple and effectual precautions; and to possess at least the means of warning its capitalists against spending their substance upon a shadow.

Such are the more prominent evils which flow from the present neglected state of mining records. The necessity for some remedy has of late been still more strongly felt, in consequence of the extensive and crowded character of numerous mining districts, and particularly that of those in the great coal-field of the North of England. The vast capital at stake there, certainly amounting to more than twelve millions sterling, and the many calamitous accidents which have occurred, have compelled all reflecting owners and agents to take the subject into their most serious consideration.

Accordingly, so early as the year 1797, public attention was called to the subject by a small tract of Mr. Thomas of Denton. A more earnest appeal was made by Mr. Chapman, a civil engineer, in 1815. But no active steps were taken. In 1830,

the establishment of a place of deposit for mining records was a leading object in the formation of the Newcastle Natural History Society, in whose transactions there is a plan for preserving records by an eminent colliery agent. Still the question of registration made no practical progress. No plans were deposited. When the British Association for the advancement of science met in Newcastle in 1838, the subject was brought prominently forward before the geological section. Strong and sound resolutions were passed upon it; and it has ever since been considered a matter of great importance by that learned body. It was by means of the scientific gentlemen connected with that section that the Government was induced to establish in London the Museum of Economic Geology; one portion of which was to be expressly devoted to the reception and arrangement of the mining documents and plans, which were confidently expected from all parts of the kingdom. All appropriate preparations were thus duly made: But the realisation of a national deposit for mining records seems as far distant as ever. With one exception no plans have been sent. It is now manifest, therefore, that a national system of registration can only be procured, like other national objects, by an act of the legislature. Registration, in short, must no longer be voluntary, but *compulsory*. There must be no choice. No statute even, if founded on any other principle, will be other than a dead letter. Ignorance, indifference, a foolish fear of injury, and a thousand vague apprehensions and prejudices, will prove insurmountable obstacles. Even if a voluntary scheme could be carried out to some extent, registration would neither be general nor uniform. Its information could not be depended upon, and its inspection would be liable to continual difficulties.

We therefore observe with much pleasure the first appearance of a distinct measure submitted to Parliament, in the form of the bill at the head of this article. We have no space to enter upon the details of the measure, which are of some extent. But we earnestly invite attention to its various provisions, which are meant to secure *a regular, uniform, authentic, correct, and permanent* record of all mining operations; and to devise proper regulations for its inspection by those who wish for information.

Some objections will be doubtless brought against this or any other scheme of records, which we shall not here seriously discuss. The trouble of making plans and returns, and the very slight cost with which they must be attended, are quite unworthy of consideration. Those mine owners who already keep accurate plans will have very little trouble or difficulty in furnishing copies. Those who do not keep such plans, or who keep no plans

at all, will be largely benefited, by being compelled to adopt measures of common caution. It should never be forgotten that no mine of any description can be properly worked, even for current operations, without a proper plan. Instead of order and design, and regularity, there is in such a case a mere trust to the chapter of accidents,—a hap-hazard and inevitable confusion: And there must consequently be great waste of mineral, capital, and labour. In a vast proportion of mining speculations it is well known that the fact of there being any profit is solely to be attributed to a prudent management of the concern, and particularly of the mining operations. In metallic mines it is of infinite importance that the adventure should be carried on throughout without a loss. But trials of this kind are often carried on for years at a loss. They are of course often abandoned on this account; and, perhaps, at a moment when they were on the eve of success. How often has it happened in the annals of mining that the next adventurers have reaped the harvest prepared by the labours of others? The chief objection however, we foresee, will be that of disclosure,—which, as in so many other cases, is a mere bugbear. The only information sought for is an accurate account of the *mining operations*. There is to be no diving into ledgers or pay-books; no demand for the balance-sheet, and no inquiry into any arrangements of the ownership or partnership. The quantity of produce may certainly be required. But there can be no secret in this. It is well known at present in all mining districts. In Cornwall the periodical accounts from all the copper and tin mines are published. In the great coal-field of the North, there has long existed a well-known trade system, which necessarily makes known not only the produce, but the capabilities and capital of every mine. In all the lead districts the same facts are as notorious as the mines themselves.

But it may be said, it is not the quantity raised, but that which is *left*, which ought not to be disclosed. But here is precisely the principal temptation for misrepresentation and fraud. If there is to be no such disclosure, may not the public be duped to give undue credit to a failing firm, or to prop it by an extended partnership? And why should a purchaser be exposed to such evident sources of dishonest dealing? Is it not fair that all parties should be, as far as possible, accurately informed of the subject of contract? If this had been the case, the country would have been spared many painful exposures, much injustice, and much litigation. Supposing, indeed, this objection ought in any instance to be held valid, it might easily be provided that the registrar should have the power of suppressing

the information for a limited number of years—and we observe that there is actually a provision of this kind in the bill. But by all means let the records be secured for ever, from the grasp of time and accident.

But whatever objections may be raised, they must not be allowed to prevail over the national interests. The time has now plainly arrived for the interference of the State. The great dangers, in all mining fields, are exhaustion, either actual or presumed, and useless expenditure of capital. Both public and private interests are at stake. These valuable resources of the nation should, as far as possible, be ascertained, and economically managed. The increasing difficulties of mining must be counteracted by provident arrangements and greater scientific research. We have already lost irrecoverably, the results of much costly experience. Geological science has been deprived of many facts, and consequently has lost frequent occasions for their useful application; yet no one can doubt, in stratified mines, the eminent services of science. The extensive coal-fields under the magnesian limestone of Durham, and the successful pursuit of coal under the red sandstone of Staffordshire, in spite of the prophecies of the *practical* men, may be mentioned among its latest triumphs; and many disgraceful failures, arising simply from an obstinate ignorance of the rudiments of geology, have occurred in almost every district of England. The difficulties occurring, in mines, from mineral dykes or veins, faults, and dislocations, can only be properly encountered by more general and comprehensive arrangements. These obstructing causes, indeed, may be accurately laid down in the working plans; but no general idea of their lines of direction, bendings, and throws can be extracted from such isolated sources.

Again, in mines worked in veins, there can be no doubt that the results of experience have been far too much overlooked. A vast proportion of our mining speculations are carried on without any proper reference to the conditions which the traditional wisdom of each district has actually ascertained. In all mining fields there are, at present, certain rules, respecting the distribution of mineral wealth, which are often attended with success. But the more audacious neglect even these; and it is no less humiliating to human wisdom than it is true, that, in the midst of the general intelligence which distinguishes working miners, the solemn farce of the divining-rod is still occasionally used for guiding the modern magician to wealth and honours. Then, again, these rules are often deficient through imperfect observation, from uncertain facts no longer admitting of proof, and from a



too limited generalisation: thus the most sagacious practical miner is liable to be misled by prejudice and a false experience. Such were the notions which long locked up, under a false seal, the profitable copper mines to the east of Truro; and which persisted, in spite alike of analogical and geological reasonings, — now happily confirmed, — in denying the existence of copper in many of the granite districts of Cornwall, or of lead ore under the trap formation of Derbyshire. However, it is a misfortune greatly to be lamented, that so many difficulties should exist in ascertaining the data of science. We must admit that the practical conclusions deduced by geology, with regard to this kind of mining, are meagre, and often not to be trusted. Geology is not yet a true practical science in all particulars: but the chief reason for this is the absence of recorded observations. Science will always give back a tenfold harvest to those who really sow her fields. As it is, much has been done by various labourers, in ascertaining, for instance, the planes of dislocation in veins, the varying *matrix* of metallic ores, the rules relating to the joints of rocks, and the most favourable direction of veins. But when profounder investigations are proposed respecting the formation and filling of veins, or their relative ages, and many other high inquiries, of the greatest possible interest to science, and possibly to mining, philosophy, for want of recorded facts, either stands silent upon the brink, or rushes headlong into the region of romance. For example, the intersections of different veins are not only of immense theoretical interest, but also, in consequence of a frequent increase of richness, of vast practical importance. Yet it is notorious that scarcely any exact description of such phenomena can be obtained; and the most contradictory statements are received during successive years. It is, indeed, highly improbable that the eye of science will ever clearly designate all the concealed treasures of the earth. The causes may be discovered, but not all the rules of their apparently capricious action. Nevertheless he who altogether denies even the utility of such researches takes a false view of the functions of experience.

It is apprehended that many of the metalliferous mines of Britain will have to encounter serious competition from countries either richer or less explored. The lead mines of this country, a few years ago, had a most severe struggle with the mines of Spain, from which they have not yet entirely recovered: and certainly they are no longer in the state described by Pliny, when their produce was so great and accessible as to require a law for limiting its annual amount. Our mines of copper too, are now engaged in a similar struggle with the more fertile mines of Cuba and Chili:

and our tin mines are similarly affected by those of the island of Banca, and other parts of the Straits of Malacca. How important, therefore, is it that the spirit of mining should be preserved from decay by wise precautions, and by all the resources which art and science can bring to its assistance! It is fearful enough to contemplate any approaching period when the British mines should cease to yield their fruits. Cool-headed economists, however, are now predicting the advent of such a day: and say they can see the historic period of the decay of British grandeur. Let us not believe these unfriendly prophets; but the vastness of the stake should compel us at least to examine the foundations of the prophecy. A great responsibility rests, therefore, upon those British statesmen who do not adequately protect this great inheritance of their country. It is an inheritance daily and hourly wasting, subject to many injurious causes of anticipation and neglect, and which, when once gone, can never be replaced. Every succeeding summer sun ripens the harvests of our fields. Silent years and stormy winters again mature the British oak. But there is no present alchemy of nature or art which can re-fill the exhausted veins of our rocks with rich copper or brilliant ores of lead. There is in our island no gigantic vegetation capable of present compression into plains of shining coal. We cannot dream, like the old chemists, that metals are *growing* while mortals are sleeping; or, like the old Peruvians, that golden sands are the daily tears of the sun; or, like the old poets, that veins are filled with splendid wealth by some 'swart faëry of the mine.' But we can at least exonerate ourselves from the scandal, which we have too long incurred, of exploring all the realms of the earth except those beneath our feet; and of registering the most minute events of the surface, but not those of surpassing interest below, which no memory can afterwards supply.

---

ART. III. — 1. *Mr. Berwick's Report to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on the Occurrences which took place in the District of Castlewellan, on the occasion of an Orange Procession on the 12th of July, 1849.* Dublin Evening Post, 17th October, 1849.

2. *Battle of Magheramayo.* Printed by James Henderson. Newry. 1849.

ONE of the saddest and most discouraging features in the condition of Ireland is the intenseness with which party-spirit rages there, — and the extent to which it perverts the minds of men of all ranks, and blinds them to their plainest duties. We

had indulged the hope that Orange riots had become a matter of history: But the sanguinary events of Dolly's Brae have dispelled this illusion, and attracted public attention to the hardest of all tasks — the government of people who boast of their loyalty as an excuse for lawlessness, and while clamorous for the rights of freemen, can only be restrained by force from engaging in civil war. Our readers are aware that the twelfth of last July was celebrated in the north of Ireland by the Orange party, — that in the county of Down the march of a procession was followed by rioting and the loss of several lives, — and that, after a formal inquiry into the circumstances by Mr. Berwick on the part of the Government, Lord Roden, Mr. W. Beers, and his brother Mr. F. C. Beers, were dismissed from the commission of the peace, in consequence of the share they had taken in these transactions.

It is with no feeling of party triumph that we approach this subject; nor do we impugn the motives of many who support, and doubtless with patriotic and religious views, the Orange Society, though we lament and condemn their conduct. But we propose to lay before the public a sketch of the occurrences at Dolly's Brae, and of the events which led to them, in the hope that if any are disposed to uphold this association as established in Ireland, they will first seriously contemplate its never-failing consequences, and the deep responsibility resting upon its supporters. Since a government can only deal with the effects of party-spirit and punish its illegal manifestations, public opinion, and the influence of dispassionate men of all shades of politics, must co-operate with the public authorities in discountenancing the feelings which are the cause of the evil, and in condemning these exhibitions of sectarian hostility, which are so fatal to the tranquillity and prosperity of Ireland.

From the inquiry made in 1835 by a Committee of the House of Commons, it appeared that the Orangemen of the north of Ireland were a party united in defence of Protestant ascendancy; which, in theory, was assumed to mean the defence of the Protestant religion against the encroachments of Romanism, — but in practice was simply the political supremacy of Protestants as such over Roman Catholics. They comprised most of the higher orders, — grand jurors, sheriffs, magistrates, clergymen, members of parliament, peers, judges, and privy councillors, — and received the physical support of the militia and yeomanry, who were constituted almost exclusively of Orangemen. The Roman Catholic party, on the other hand, was composed of the lower orders of the population. Without leaders to guide and restrain them almost without arms, (for the magistrates issued arms to

none but their own adherents,) without money to contend for justice in the courts of law, they had little to trust to but their numbers.

Nothing could be more praiseworthy than the published rules of the Orange Society. They prescribed loyalty as the point of honour, — obedience to the law as the first duty : they prohibited the admission of any one capable of upbraiding another on account of his religious opinions, and they inculcated peace and good-will. But never did any society exhibit such a glaring inconsistency, — rather such a positive contradiction between its professed principles and its actual practice. The facts which came out before the Committee surprised all parties,— none more, we believe, than the Grand Master himself. It appeared that the Orange oath of allegiance had once been avowedly ‘conditional’; and that the same spirit remained, although the words had been changed; that, contrary to law, warrants had been issued to military bodies; that the inadvertence of the Grand Master had been taken advantage of, and his confidence abused by the officers of the institution; that the practice of the society was to resort to every contrivance — by songs, speeches, party tunes, processions, emblems and mottoes — to insult, to domineer over, to offend and irritate their Roman Catholic neighbours; and the result of its working was seen in outrages, murders, houses wrecked, villages destroyed, riots without number, law perverted, justice denied, and the animosity of the rival parties wrought up to madness.

To give some idea of the responsibility falling upon those who encourage Orange processions, we will enumerate a few of the principal Orange riots in the five years preceding the formal dissolution of the society in 1836. At Crossgar, in 1830, in the county of Down, a formidable armed procession, exhibiting warrants from the Duke of Cumberland, openly resisted the police, and only retreated before an overpowering military force. At Dungannon, in Tyrone, they overawed the magistrates, and by force compelled them to disobey the orders of the Government. At Tanderaghee there were riots and murders. At Maghera, in Londonderry, the Roman Catholic party having dispersed, the Orangemen broke their promise to the magistrates, evaded the troops, and rushed upon the village of Drumard. There they fired upon the peasantry who fled; and continued to wreck and burn the houses, until at length the military reappeared, and drove them back at the point of the bayonet. Mr. Hunter, the magistrate, in his official report to Government, says, ‘Anything so disgraceful to the character of men and of Protestants, — so savage, so lawless, and so uncalled for, — cannot be forgotten; the whole

'was done with such deliberation, and in open defiance of the law.' In Armagh,—and this instance shall conclude our list for 1830,—some Orangemen passing in procession through the Roman Catholic village of Maghery, and playing the 'Protestant Boys,' were beaten and their drums broken. Two days afterwards the Orangemen attacked Maghery. There was no opposition,—the inhabitants fled for their lives: an old man was beaten,—a widow, within eight days of her confinement, was wounded with a bayonet, and knocked down,—her son, a half-witted lad, was fired at,—another woman and her infant were beaten and knocked down,—and twenty-eight houses wrecked and burned, and every particle of property pillaged and destroyed. The sequel is characteristic of the state of society there. The Roman Catholics, who broke the drums, were convicted, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment: but, though the wrecking of Maghery took place in open day, in the presence of Colonel Verner himself, though the rioters' names were known and their identity sworn to, not one of them received any punishment whatsoever!

These horrible events startled even Colonel Verner and his brother Orangemen; and the advice they then gave derives additional weight from recent occurrences. They earnestly recommended the abandonment of all party processions; and 'trusted that no persons of respectability would be found so regardless of consequences as to incur the heavy responsibility of countenancing the celebration of any day, in a manner calculated to give offence to any person whatever.' But having thus discharged their consciences, they continued to support and stimulate Orange processions by every means in their power.

In 1831, at Tullyorier, in the county of Down, an old woman was shot in her house; and four men were pursued by the Orange party, fired upon, and driven into the river, where they were drowned. In 1832, under the impending Party Processions' Act, the Orange leaders exerted themselves, and with considerable success, to prevent the usual processions; but at Dungannon their advice was not followed, and riots took place. In 1833 there was great rioting at Lurgan, Tanderaghee (where at Lord Mandeville's gate, a magistrate was burned in effigy in the presence of Dean Carter), Loughgall, Ballyhagan, and Cootehill. In 1834, similar scenes were enacted at Belfast, Portglenone, Portadown, and Dungannon. In 1835, there were numerous riots—at Belfast, Kilrea, and other places; but we have no room for an account of any except that at Annahagh, near Armagh. A Protestant and his daughter had there been beaten by the Roman Catholics; in revenge for which the Orangemen

turned out, armed with their yeomanry firelocks; they attacked Annahagh, and burned and wrecked nine houses, when they were stopped and driven off by the police and military. It is almost superfluous to record that for beating the man and his daughter four Roman Catholics were transported,—but for burning nine houses, not a single Orangeman was punished in any way. There is a melancholy similarity in the details of these occurrences, proving that they did not arise from accidental or different causes; but were the certain result of a *system*, according to which the Orange processions were arranged on recurring anniversaries, in the way calculated to produce the utmost excitement and irritation.

They assembled with drums and banners, and were well armed. Magistrates were at their head, and they were generally reviewed by some man of rank and influence. They were informed that peace and harmony was the rule of all Orangemen,—but were bid to remember their rights; they were charged to die in defence of their religion, and they answered by a cheer for Protestant ascendancy. They were told not to upbraid any one, yet at the very time the bands were playing ‘Croppies lie down’: they were instructed to obey the law, but they knew they were safe from its operation: a sermon was preached, but the text was, ‘love the *brotherhood*’: if police or military were present, they were a protection but no restraint, for they could not act except under the orders of the Orange magistrate: and so,—with ringing cheers, music playing, banners waving, drums beating, guns firing, confident in their superior strength, mad with sectarian bigotry and political hatred, and excited to the utmost,—the Orange procession approached a Roman Catholic village. On the other hand, the Roman Catholics, full of ancient quarrels, and galled by intolerable insult, seldom lost an opportunity of revenge, and sometimes ventured on open resistance. They swarmed from their cabins like bees from their hive; old guns were brought out, and pikes, scythes, and pitchforks made up in some sort for the want of better arms.

When two such bodies came into contact, collision was certain and instantaneous. It signified nothing who began: a push, a blow, a shot fired in the air, sufficed to hurry both parties into the predetermined conflict. But mere numbers have never been a match for an armed and organised body. The Orangemen were invariably successful; and they inflicted a terrible retribution—while the Roman Catholics, driven from the field, read the hopelessness of resistance written upon their plundered houses and burning villages. In the courts of law their defeat was still more matter of course. Roman Catholics were arrested and punished;

but the dominant faction was always safe. Informations against Orange offenders had to be sworn before Orange magistrates, bills to be found by Orange grand jurors, the jury was impanelled by an Orange sheriff, and the verdict was given by an Orange jury, upon prisoners ostentatiously wearing Orange rosettes even in the dock! Intimidation of witnesses prevailed to a frightful extent; but when that failed, acquittals were given against evidence, against the judges' charges, and even against the prisoners' own confession. So that after every fresh struggle the parties retired to prepare for another contest,—one animated by their victory, the other feeling that Protestant ascendancy was Roman Catholic slavery, and doggedly determined not to submit to the one nor acknowledge the other.

It was very extraordinary to see men of education, principle, and otherwise estimable character, so deceived by their own assertions, and so bewildered by the noxious influence of party-spirit, that though familiar with the state of things we have described, they actually denied its existence, or boldly attempted to justify it to the world. Colonel Verner asserted that the Orange Society, as a body, had never interfered in any political question; Colonel Blacker did not consider 'Croppies lie down' a party tune; affirmed that the anniversaries of the 12th of July were peculiarly tranquil, and that the administration of justice was pure. The inquiry by the Committee of 1835, however, brought the truth fully to light. The exposure was complete, the condemnation universal: all classes, creeds, and parties then united in declaring, that the Orange organisation must be arrested, that the supremacy of the law must be vindicated, and that no party in the State should be permitted to arrogate to themselves superior privileges, and insult their fellow subjects, on the ground of a purer religious belief or on the false and insolent plea of superior loyalty.

The Orange leaders, we are happy to say, at this juncture yielded a manly and dignified obedience to the will of the nation as expressed in an address of the House of Commons and the answer of the Crown. Notwithstanding considerable resistance from the Irish portion of the body, the Grand Lodge, in April 1836, dissolved the society; and through their organs proclaimed that they did so, not in compliance with expediency, but for the sake of principle,—that they would neither repent of the deed nor recall it.

Old Sir Harcourt Lees was, we believe, the only one who resisted to the death. The Widdrington of the party, he fought upon his stumps, for pure fighting's sake, when all hope was gone. Orange to the backbone, and priding himself on his loyalty, his

fidelity to his order, his religion, and his acuteness, he defied to the last the King, the Grand Master, the precepts of Christianity, and the dictates of common sense; declaring that 'he would not 'be humbugged,' and in the blasphemous and ferocious slang of the party, calling 'on his brave brethren of Ulster to increase 'and multiply—to 'be tranquil and vigilant,—to put their trust 'in God, and keep their powder dry.' Poor Sir Harcourt Lees! had he lived to march with the procession from Lord Roden's park to Dolly's Brae, and to read Mr. Beers' letters, he would have died contented. He indeed has gone—but his mantle has descended upon not unworthy shoulders.

The voluntary dissolution of the Orange Institution was a political act of some importance. It was an acceptance by that body of the principle already enunciated through the public voice—that the assumption of ascendancy by any one class of men over another, in virtue of their political or religious opinions, was repugnant to the spirit of the British constitution; and that, whatever the theory of Orangeism might be, its practical result was to produce and perpetuate dissension, and to endanger property and life. The propriety of the dissolution, too, was speedily seen in the improved state of the public peace: for twelve years we hear little of Orange riots, and nothing of such burnings and wreckings as those of Maghera, Maghery, and Annahagh. But there are men, as there are political parties, who can learn nothing and forget nothing,—who cannot forget the excitement of party cheers and the pride of a party triumph, nor learn that he who stimulates the passions of a crowd must be responsible for the excesses which they afterwards commit. It seems incredible, that after such experience of the pernicious results of the Orange Society, and after the enjoyment of twelve years' peace in consequence of its dissolution, men should be found sufficiently rash and blind to consequences, to resuscitate it again, and reopen its bitter fountain of strife. It is, if possible, still more extraordinary to see a peer coming forward in his place in Parliament, and boasting of his religious feelings and pacific speeches and good intentions, when wreckings, burnings, and murders on the very spot where he reestablished this mischievous organisation, and in consequence of it, and by the very men whom he had harangued, attest the gravity of the responsibility which rests upon his head, and the folly of expecting that the old tree would bear any but the old fruit.

From 1836 to 1845 Lord Roden and the other leading men exerted their influence, honestly and successfully, in discountenancing processions; and no disturbance of any consequence took place: But in 1845 the scene changed. Notwithstanding



the agitation for repeal, the Government of the day refused to rule through the medium of a party, or on the principle of ascendancy; and while they opposed *repealers*, they supported measures to which they thought *Roman Catholics* were entitled. This policy gave deep offence to the Ulster Orangemen; and much discussion followed, whether, the 'Party Processions' Act' having now expired, the system of Orange processions should not be renewed. On the whole the general feeling was against such a step; and Lord Roden, on the 3rd of July in that year, issued a letter deprecating it in strong language. In some quarters his influence was of no avail: an armed procession took place at Armagh, and one Roman Catholic was shot dead, and three others wounded. A Mr. Watson of Brookhill presided over an Orange meeting at Lisburn; and, in reply to Lord Roden's letter, informed him, 'That the minds of his friends were made up, and 'they were resolved to proceed with their procession.' A manly and forcible remonstrance from Lord Londonderry was answered with a rude and insolent rebuke, and Mr. Watson, though a deputy-lieutenant, accompanied the procession he had encouraged.

The Government now attempted to quell the growing evil, and superseded Mr. Watson—on the broad principle which they were then applying to those magistrates who attended repeal meetings,—that where criminal acts were likely to arise out of violent party meetings, the administration of justice could not be safely entrusted to magistrates who, by attending and countenancing such meetings, constituted themselves open and acknowledged partisans. But the Orangemen had been too long accustomed to regard a violent partisan spirit as giving them a claim to the favour of Government, to submit to the honest and impartial application of a different principle. They instantly made common cause with Mr. Watson, and also with Mr. Archdall of Fermanagh, who was superseded on similar grounds. Through the press they called upon Orangemen 'to *make themselves feared*, in order to be respected by the Government: there must be monster meetings, but no infringement 'of the law.' Lord Roden now praised Mr. Watson for having done the very thing he had written to him not to do. Lord Enniskillen, the Marquis of Downshire, and other noblemen, placed themselves at the head of the movement; meetings were held in all the northern counties; the flame lighted by party spirit spread like wildfire; and in October, Lord Roden, as the trusted leader and Deputy Grand Master, though Lord Enniskillen was the Grand Master, issued a formal address announcing the re-establishment of the Orange Society. But though the

Society was re-organised, the influential members thought it prudent to discountenance processions: and, with the exception of a considerable meeting in honour of Mr. Watson, which produced a riot of no great importance, their advice was generally followed, and tranquillity prevailed during 1846 and 1847.

The next step was taken in 1848. The events of that year induced most of the principal bodies in Ireland to come forward and offer their services to the Queen's Government. Lord Clarendon did not undervalue the moral support thus afforded to him, and he replied to their addresses in terms of courtesy and thankfulness: But for the means of crushing rebellion he looked only to the civil and military power, which the law places under the control of the constitutional authorities. Notwithstanding the alarming aspect of the times, he gave no encouragement to volunteer associations, nor to any extra-legal manifestations of physical strength, by the well-disposed portion of the community. He did not permit any arms to be issued to volunteers; he received with becoming and grateful acknowledgments the address from the Dublin University, but prohibited the intended procession of two thousand students. But this steady and cautious policy did not suit the views of the Orange party; and they resolved to make the occasion of manifesting their loyalty an opportunity of displaying the strength of their organisation, by reappearing on the stage, and celebrating the 12th of July in 1848, as they had done twelve years before, with every well-remembered device by which the enthusiasm of their own party could be stimulated. How little any support of this nature was required by the Government may be judged from the fact, that when the time came for the Government to put forth its strength, it overpowered all resistance with such extreme facility as to cast an air of ridicule over its previous preparations.

The Orange manifestation having been determined on, the processions for the county of Down were arranged by Mr. W. Beers, a magistrate and the county grand master; and in reply to a note from this gentleman Lord Roden addressed to him a letter, from which we copy the following extracts:—

‘ Tollymore Park; July 8. 1848.

‘ Had it been consistent with your arrangements, I should have been happy that the ground chosen for your meeting was within the gates of Tollymore Park, where an opportunity would have been afforded me of *witnessing the numbers*, as well as the order and loyalty, of those lodges over which you preside. I am anxious to assure the brethren that, though I am advanced in years, and time has rapidly rolled on since in the year 1834 we met in such force, order, and loyalty on the hill of Rathfriland, yet the principles I then held, I still maintain.’

'The Orangemen of Ireland have been the peculiar objects of God's distinguishing care. They have been the continual subjects of persecution. The several administrations, whether Whig or Tory, who have ruled the country for the last twenty years, have combined by legislative enactments to crush the Protestant interest in Ireland.'

He then enumerates the measures :—

'Funds for scriptural education on Protestant principles refused—Protestant corporations destroyed—Roman Catholic municipalities erected on their ruins—the Charitable Bequests Act made law—the inconsistent grant to Maynooth adopted, though opposed to the conscience and wishes of the great mass of the enlightened people of the empire.'

Lord Roden has asserted, that on the late occasion he did not *invite* the Orangemen to assemble in his park; he only 'would not shut his gates against them.' The difference certainly is not much. But it is not until we read the first sentence of the letter of last year that we can thoroughly appreciate the skill with which Lord Roden induced his friends to visit him, without depriving himself of the power of denying that he invited them.

Lord Roden is a peer and a privy councillor; he was for many years a deputy-lieutenant of the county of Down, and *custos rotulorum* of another county; he is of mature age, accustomed to survey politics from an elevated position, and of some note in what is called the religious world. We have therefore a right to expect that he should weigh the consequences of his actions; that he should feel himself in some degree answerable for the conduct of those whose political course he guides, and to whom he lends the sanction of his ancient name and irreproachable private character; that he should never countenance by his actions what in words he condemns; that he should scorn to limit his obedience to the mere letter of the laws of his country, but manfully uphold them in their true scope and spirit.

It is, then, with surprise that we find him referring with pride to an Orange meeting in 1834, while he passes over the meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland on the 14th of April, 1836, when, after long discussion, Lord Roden himself presiding, they passed this resolution :—

'It seems to this Grand Lodge that the end for which the Orange Association was originally framed,—namely the promotion of the interests of the Protestant population of Ireland,—will no longer be served by the further continuance of that institution; and that, in conformity with the expressed will of the Sovereign, the Orange Association ought to be, and is hereby dissolved.'

With the wreckings and murders of Tullyorier, Annahagh,

and Maghery fresh in his recollection, he now presumes to say that the Orangemen of Ireland have been the peculiar objects of God's distinguishing care. Though Mr. S. O'Brien was then reviewing the clubs of Cork, the loyalty of the Orange leader evaporates in a condemnation of various measures passed by the Imperial Parliament. He is not ashamed to confess, (for it seems to raise in his mind no suspicion of error,) that for twenty years every statesman had been opposed to his views; nor does he hesitate at the monstrous assertion, that the grant to Maynooth, — which was sanctioned by every parliament for fifty years, proposed with the approbation of George III., Mr. Pitt, and the Duke of Portland; increased in 1807 when Mr. Perceval was a minister, and again in 1813; again increased in 1845 by a majority in the House of Commons of 323 to 176, including all the most distinguished leaders on both sides of the House; and by a majority in the House of Lords of 226 to 69, — was opposed to the conscience and wishes of the great mass of the enlightened people of the empire.

Whatever we may think of this letter as a true statement of facts, there is no doubt that it was admirably adapted to the taste of those for whom it was published; and, considered merely as a party address, it evinces no mean ability. Mr. W. Beers was not likely a second time to omit making Tollymore Park the place of rendezvous; a second hint, — for, after Lord Roden's denial, we must not say invitation, — would be quite superfluous. The Orange party were gratified by having such an unexceptionable witness to *their numbers*, as well as to their order and loyalty. If it should be said that Orange processions had been condemned by the Legislature, by every statesman of whatever politics, even by the most zealous leaders of the Grand Orange Lodge, — that they were contrary to the spirit, as for many years they had been contrary to the letter, of the law, — there stood a deputy-lieutenant and custos rotulorum to encourage them to disregard such considerations. If an impending rebellion suggested that their first duty was to defend the integrity of the kingdom, their attention was skilfully diverted from such a topic by an enumeration of their grievances, the most flagrant of which were that Roman Catholics should have a college for the education of their priests, should be members of municipal corporations, and be allowed to bequeath their own money for charitable and religious purposes. Could his political followers doubt that what they disapproved of, was opposed to the conscience and wishes of the great mass of the enlightened people of the empire, when the word of a venerable peer was pledged to the fact? Could Orangemen fail to believe that, notwithstanding

all their excesses, they were still the peculiar objects of God's distinguishing care, when they were solemnly assured of it by one so eminent for his religious professions?

Under these auspices, there was a great Orange demonstration on the 12th of July, 1848; and party-spirit not being yet roused, the day passed off without disturbance. But the seed of mischief was sown. The evil of these exclusive associations is the ill-will which they engender, the resistance which they provoke, and the counter-associations which they infallibly call into existence. While life and strength remain, no men fit for anything but slavery will submit to be triumphed over; or accept the badge of inferiority, sought to be fastened on them by a rival faction. The Roman Catholic or Ribbon party accordingly resolved, in their turn, to celebrate *their* festival day, the 17th of March. This was the second stage of the disease; and riot became inevitable. In addition to the 12th of July and St. Patrick's day, funerals furnish opportunities to the rival factions of trying their strength, so that several conflicts took place. At Rathfriland an Orangeman was killed; in Leitrim there was some disturbance; at Londonderry the military were called out; at Crossgar, in the county of Down, the Ribbonmen marched in an armed procession, and in the riot which followed three persons lost their lives; at Tullyorier, in the same county, a procession took place on the occasion of the funeral of an Orangeman who had been killed in an affray, and twenty houses belonging to Roman Catholics were more or less wrecked. By these assaults the spirit of faction was effectually resuscitated; there was ample cause for crimination and recrimination, — each party had wrongs to avenge, — each was now fairly *blooded*, — and, in the county of Down at least, it was plain that the Orange procession of the next 12th of July would be the signal for a more determined contest than had yet taken place.

As the 12th of July, 1849, approached, signs of the coming strife became apparent. When it was known that the Orangemen were to meet at Tollymore Park and march through Dolly's Brae, and that the Ribbonmen were determined to resist them, considerable alarm was manifested. The legality of processions became so much a subject of discussion, that the Assistant-Barrister, at the Newry Quarter Sessions, thought it advisable to warn the country, that none but persons duly authorised by law were entitled to assemble in numbers and in public with arms. The Bishop of Down and Connor addressed to the members of the Established Church within his dioceses, a truly Christian letter, beseeching them 'to refrain from processions, calculated as they 'surely were to engender strife;' and indeed it was most fitting

that the Bishop should step forward in the cause of peace, if we may believe Lord Massareene, who hastened to assure his lordship that 'the clergy appear to be the chief promoters of the 'Orange demonstrations.'

Lord Massareene is another specimen of that class who so easily divest themselves of moral responsibility, and whose words afford no clue to anticipate their actions. He 'would rejoice to 'see the excellent advice of the bishop followed;' he 'dreads 'the Orange demonstrations being looked upon as a triumph of 'party;' he 'need scarce inform his lordship that he is no party 'man;' he 'is anxious to respond to the bishop's appeal, and 'agrees with him as to the dangerous tendency of the custom of 'walking in processions with badges and music;'—and then, to show how truly he entertained the sentiments he professed, three days afterwards he received in his park an Orange meeting of 12,000 persons, with 100 drums and 180 banners, under an arcade ornamented with laurels and orange flowers—and even his son's pony was decorated with orange ribbons. This letter of Lord Massareene's enables us to test the value of pacific professions in the mouths of Orange leaders, and we can sympathise with the growing feeling of anxiety which prevailed, when the newspapers teemed with accounts of the preparations for the intended display, and declared that they were greater than had been known in the memory of man.

But it is full time to come to the conflict at Dolly's Brae. This spot had already become notorious in the annals of party-strife. Thirty-four years ago, in a contest which took place there, a Roman Catholic was killed. His widowed mother soon followed him to the grave; but left her dying injunction, so the story goes, that no Orange procession should ever be allowed to pass that way. After her death her name was given to the hill; and it became a point of honour with the Orange party to march in procession over 'Dolly's' brae, and with the Roman Catholics to prevent them. It is situated about two miles from Castlewella, on the old road from Rathfriland, which passes through Ballyward, the hamlet of Magheramayo, and Dolly's Brae. This road is so bad and hilly, that a new one was made a few years ago, which, diverging from the other at Ballyward school-house, about three miles from Castlewella, takes the level ground to Castlewella, where the roads unite again. The hill road, though the shorter of the two, is rarely used,—the new one being more level and convenient. So that a procession going from Ballyward to Castlewella would avoid Dolly's Brae, unless indeed they went out of their way on purpose.

The arrangement of the procession and the choice of the route

devolved, as before, upon Mr. W. Beers. He was aware that the new road was the natural one,—he admits that on the preceding anniversary it had been adopted, and that no collision took place: But he had heard that to pass through Dolly's Brae would be regarded as a triumph by the Orange party! and this motive appears to have outweighed all other considerations in the mind of the magistrate. About the middle of June, according to his own account, he issued his orders through Mr. Jardine of Rathfriland, that the procession should take the Dolly's Brae road, and he was careful to communicate the order to his friend and correspondent—Lord Roden. That there should be no mistake, the rendezvous of the lodges was fixed at Ballyward, near the point of divergence of the two roads, at the house of his brother, Mr. F. C. Beers, another magistrate,—and in Tollymore Park he himself repeated the order to the Orangemen to return, as they had arrived, by Dolly's Brae.

The consequences of this order were foreseen. After consultation among the magistrates, one of them, Mr. T. Scott, went to Dublin, and requested that a strong force should be sent down. Accordingly, two stipendiary magistrates, two troops of cavalry, two companies of infantry, and a sub-inspector and forty policemen, were despatched to Castlewellon and Rathfriland, where the sub-inspector, Mr. Hill, was stationed with thirty-four of his own constabulary. In the meantime proof was accumulating that these precautions were not unnecessary. It was openly stated in the newspapers that the Roman Catholics had held a meeting, and were determined to resist the march of the Orange procession through Dolly's Brae,—and an anonymous letter was sent on the 9th of July to a magistrate, Mr. George Shaw, Lord Annesey's agent, professing to come from the repealers; 'to give you, and Moore, and the Beers, and Roden, and Hill, and Skinner, and all other magistrets, with the pig-drovers, the police, and your handful of solgers, to meet us on Dolly's Brae, on the 12 morning inst to show your valure,' &c. We have quoted the date and some of the words of this epistle, that our readers may see the character of the 'challenge,' which the member for Fermanagh, in a style of argument savouring rather of Tipperary than Westminster Hall, and with a great contempt for the date of Mr. Beers' order, adduced in Parliament as the cause and justification of the march through Dolly's Brae.

Early on the morning of the 12th, the military and police occupied the pass of Dolly's Brae; and the Ribbonmen, who had begun to collect in great numbers, finding their intentions anticipated, moved off towards Magheramayo; and, after firing and manœuvring in their own fashion, finally posted themselves on

the side of the hill above the road. The Orange lodges from the Rathfriland district collected at Mr. F. C. Beers' house at Ballyward. The magistrates who had gone to the same place, — seeing that the Orangemen were armed and preparing to advance, and perceiving through a telescope that the Ribbonmen had assembled in force to oppose them, — became alarmed for the result, and Mr. Scott proposed to Mr. Beers that the procession should go by the level road to Castlewellan. The reply was almost in the same words as those previously used by Mr. Jardine to Mr. Hill, — ‘that no power on earth would prevent the Orange-men going by Dolly's Brae.’ The magistrates seem to have thought that the only course open to them in such circumstances was to intimidate the Ribbonmen by a display of police and military, and by main force prevent an actual conflict. Accordingly the military were hastily brought up from Rathfriland, and the procession was formed, — the police and dragoons going in front, — followed by the Orangemen, many of whom were armed, and at intervals in the line were carts covered with grass and containing fire-arms. Before they reached Dolly's Brae, a negotiation with the Ribbonmen had been opened by the party there, through the medium of two Roman Catholic priests, and by great exertions a kind of armed truce was established, — so that the procession passed on undisturbed towards Tollymore Park.

Lord Roden, on horseback, received the party at his gate and entered the park at their head. He describes the procession as consisting of fifty lodges, composed of 2000 men, of whom he saw 300 armed, besides women and children. Refreshments were then served in tents, and there were barrels of beer and bread and cheese for the crowd.

Captain Fitzmaurice, the stipendiary magistrate, now applied to Lord Roden, urging him to use his influence with the Orangemen to induce them not to return by Dolly's Brae, saying, — ‘They have had triumph enough now, and why go back and run the risk of bloodshed?’ He replied that he feared he had no influence, but would speak to the Grand Master, Mr. W. Beers. He did so, and even suggested — ‘Would it not be better for them to go that way?’ but on receiving from the Grand Master the answer — ‘Oh, there will be no danger, and it would be impracticable or impossible, as there would be a split,’ — he felt the answer to be so satisfactory that he did not press the matter any further.

The Orangemen, having enjoyed the hospitality of Tollymore Park, were summoned by the sound of a bugle round a platform, where Mr. Beers addressed them, requesting them to return



quietly by Dolly's Brae. Lord Roden also spoke:—he congratulated them on their numbers; told them that it was for the right of private judgment in the study of God's Word that Orangemen contended; trusted that they would never forget the preservation of their rights; talked about the magnificent scenery and the coming of the Queen, and inculcated forbearance and love. Lord Roden, but apparently only after the manner of Lord Massareene, 'disapproves of processions altogether.' He takes some credit for allowing the procession to come to his park, — 'for then I should have an opportunity of addressing them, 'and requesting them to conduct themselves properly, and by 'all means to preserve the peace.' If Lord Roden felt that his influence would be efficacious in inducing an excited multitude to avoid a breach of the peace, it seems extraordinary that, when he was requested to persuade them to take the ordinary road homewards, he should have told Captain Fitzmaurice that *he had no influence*. The peaceful address which he was so anxious to deliver, and on which his adherents now lay so great stress, was after all not particularly successful,—perhaps because, as Mr. Scott tells us, 'part of the speech was quite inaudible in 'consequence of the uproar.'

Towards six o'clock the drums of the Orangemen announced to the party at Dolly's Brae the return of the procession, which was about three quarters of a mile long, armed, as Major Wilkinson says, to the teeth. The guns in fact had now been taken out of the carts, and Constable Scanlan counted *four hundred and twenty-eight* stand of arms in the procession—exclusive of those in the hands of the Castlewellan party. In front came Mr. Hill's police, then the Orangemen, next came the dragoons, then another party of police, and last of all the infantry. Mr. Scott makes honourable mention of the Roman Catholic priest, Mr. Morgan, who exerted himself to the utmost to keep the people quiet. But the excitement, which in the morning had been almost uncontrollable, had now risen to fury. The women and children of the Roman Catholic party collected on the sides of the road, and covered the Orangemen with taunts and execrations. They retorted with the cry — 'There's a priest—to 'hell with the priest—to hell with the Pope!' and in this manner Dolly's Brae was passed.

When the police at the head of the procession reached the place where the Ribbonmen had collected on Magheramayo Hill, they found them in three divisions, numbering about 1200 men, posted behind some walls, the nearest about a hundred yards from the road. On coming abreast of the wall, the police halted between the Ribbonmen on the hill and the

Orangemen on the road, and remained stationary until the rear of the procession was in the act of passing them. At this critical moment a shot or squib was fired from the head of the procession\*: immediately came two shots from the hill, then a volley, and then the firing was general on both sides. Mr. Hill's police charged up the hill and fired upon the Ribbonmen, who soon broke and fled, on which the fire of the police ceased, and they secured a number of prisoners. Nearly two hundred Orangemen also began to ascend the hill, and kept up a fire upon the retreating Ribbonmen; and while the rear part of the procession were thus engaged, those who were in front broke loose from all restraint in Magheramayo, where there was no opposition, and began to burn and wreck the houses, while some scattered themselves over the fields to complete the same work of devastation. The dragoons now pushed forward, and drove the Orangemen onwards towards Rathfriland. By this time a number of houses were blazing, and a party of police were sent to extinguish the flames. Mr. Scott saw two men trying to set fire to a house: he struck one and took the gun from the other. Mr. Tighe, a magistrate, saw an Orangeman firing into the thatch of a house, but never thought of arresting him. Inspector Corry went into six burning houses: from one an old woman was struggling to escape, but the door was partially closed, and the blazing thatch falling in; and she would have been burned to death had he not saved her. A policeman rescued a girl eighteen years old from another house. Sub-constable Fair took a woman out of a house on fire in a desperate state, blackened and wounded. Another constable saw an Orangeman strike a woman with the butt end of his gun as she was trying to get away.

‘ The work of retaliation, both on life and property, by the Orango party, was proceeding lower down the hill, and along the side of the road, in a most brutal and wanton manner, reflecting the deepest disgrace on all by whom it was perpetrated and encouraged. One little boy, ten years old, was deliberately fired at, and shot, while running across a field. Mr. Fitzmaurice stopped a man in the act of firing at a girl who was rushing from her father's house; an old woman of seventy was murdered; and the skull of an idiot was

---

\* The evidence is conflicting, whether the squib came from the road or the hill. There are seven or eight witnesses in support of each opinion: but where there is plainly a general leaning towards the Orangemen, — the agreement *against* them of the three commanding officers, Major White, of the Enniskillens, Captain Fitzmaurice, the stipendiary magistrate, and Mr. Hill, the Inspector of Police, is to our judgment conclusive.

beaten in with the butts of their muskets. Another old woman was severely beaten in her house; while another, who was subsequently saved by the police, was much injured, and left in her house which had been set on fire; an inoffensive man was taken out of his house, dragged to his garden, and stabbed to death by three men with bayonets, in the sight of some of his family. The Roman Catholic chapel, the house of the Roman Catholic curate, and the National School-house were fired into, and the windows broken, and a number of the surrounding houses of the Roman Catholic inhabitants were set on fire and burnt, every article of furniture having been first wantonly destroyed therein.' (*Mr. Berwick's Report.*)

The scenes which took place in the houses are best described in the witnesses' own words:—

'*Bridget King.* I know Pat King, who was killed on the 12th of July: he was taking care of his mother, on that day: the door was shut. I saw the Orangemen fire at the house: they broke in the door; they pulled him over the garden ditch and stabbed him,—he died in ten minutes afterwards: he was not out of the house that day.'

We condense the evidence as to Arthur Traynor. He was standing near his own house—had no arms in his hands on the 12th—was hit with a ball in the cheek—ran to Mr. F. C. Beers to save his life—Mr. Beers thought him a peaceably disposed man—ran him among the prisoners, where he was handcuffed. No attention was paid to him for four days. On the 16th, when under examination before the coroner, it was made known that the ball was still in his face. On the 17th, this man, who had not had arms in his hands, and was known by Mr. Beers to be a peaceable man, having had his house burned, all his property destroyed, and being himself severely wounded, *was discharged!*

'*Margaret Traynor.* The men with sashes on them fired into my house, and burned it, and destroyed it: they chased the old woman who is dead into the byre, and followed her—I saw her after they went away: she was then drawing breath, but she died in about an hour afterwards. They shot my husband in the cheek and made a prisoner of him. I saw Pat King a killing: they dragged him out of his house: he begged for mercy: he got away from them and ran into the garden: three of the men made a bounce at him: others following them: they stoned him in the garden: I saw him gathering himself up and begging for mercy.'

'*Margaret King.* I was in the house when the door was broken and my uncle Pat King killed: the house filled in with Orangemen: one of them hit him on the head with a stone: three of them then took him down to the low room. I got into a field. One of the Orangemen said "D—n your soul for a Popish b—h," and knocked me down off the garden ditch with a stone. When I returned to the

garden, three of them had my uncle down and were stabbing him. I got into a byre and hid in some hay: some of them came in and stabbed the cow in two places — broke the stake and let her out. When I could do so with safety I went to my uncle, and got his head on my knee: he lived about ten minutes after that. The dragoons came up just as my uncle was dying: one of them said "May be he'll come to again." They (the Orangemen) d—d my grandmother, who is an old bed-ridden woman the last year and a half, — spat in her face, hit her on the head with a stone — cut her arms, and then smashed a chair on her forehead.'

The result of this day's proceedings seems to have been that four Roman Catholics lost their lives, besides a considerable number wounded. And it is particularly to be noticed that only one of these lives was lost in the conflict on the hill. When armed parties are firing on each other, bloodshed is the natural consequence; and some allowance may be claimed on account of the excitement of the actual struggle, and the absence of individual animosity. But even this can hardly be said of the little boy, Hugh King, for though shot in the field, he was deliberately singled out. The other three were cases of cold-blooded, deliberate, wilful murder, where there was neither danger, provocation, nor resistance. John Sweeny, an idiot, was found on the road with his skull battered to pieces. Patrick King was dragged out of his cabin, stabbed, and beaten to death. Ann Traynor, a woman seventy years of age, was cruelly beaten, and died soon after. Eight houses, one of them belonging to 'Buck' Ward and half a mile from the scene of conflict, were wrecked and burned; and a great many others, including the Roman Catholic curate's house, the chapel and school-house, were fired into and more or less injured. That three women, one of them badly wounded, were not burned to death in their houses, was solely owing to the timely interference of the police.

So perfectly in the short space of twelve months did Lord Roden and Mr. Beers, by re-establishing Orange processions in the county of Down, reproduce the horrors of Maghera and Annahagh. But savage and brutal as was this scene, the events which followed are, to our minds, more deeply disgusting.

On the Monday following, an inquest was held on the bodies by Mr. George Tyrrell, the coroner of the district, no novice in these inquisitions. In his charge he informed the jury that this armed procession of 2000 men was a legal assembly. He admitted that some persons were of a different opinion, but 'he believed that he carried with him the opinion of many of 'the magistrates who sat on the Bench.' He might, we humbly conceive, have been more positive on this point; con-

sidering that Mr. F. C. Beers was sitting beside him, along with Captain Hill, Lord Roden's agent, and other magistrates who had accompanied the procession. He further instructed them 'that the Government so far countenanced these processions that they sent an armed force to protect not only the 'processionists, but to guard the peace of the country.' The jury, we must presume, were satisfied with Mr. Tyrrell's exposition of the law and of the policy of the Government; because, instead of returning a verdict of wilful murder against those persons known or unknown who had entered a cabin and beaten to death an unoffending man and an old woman, they simply found that the deceased had died from injuries inflicted by persons unknown in a party procession. The intrepid coroner went so far as to suggest a verdict of *justifiable homicide*! but this was rather too much; so the jury confined themselves to the established precedent.

Next day there was a magisterial inquiry. Captain Skinner, a magistrate and agent to the Marquis of Downshire, having asserted that 'the people ought to be satisfied with justice as it 'is administered in Castlewellan petty sessions,' it becomes interesting to observe how even-handed is the justice which an Orange magistrate, and one of the most upright of his class, thinks good enough for 'the people', and to test the moral obligation on Roman Catholics to have entire confidence in the impartiality of Mr. Shaw (Lord Annesley's agent), Captain Tighe, Mr. Hill (Lord Roden's agent), and the two Messrs. Beers, who were present on this occasion. We are glad to learn that for firing upon the Orangemen and police, twenty of the Ribbon party were committed for trial: But we were hardly prepared to find that for firing upon the Ribbonmen—even when running away and in defiance of the orders of the stipendiary magistrate, Captain Fitzmaurice,—for murdering three helpless unoffending Catholics,—for burning eight houses,—for robbing, wrecking, and injuring a great many more, including a chapel and school-house, all done in broad daylight, in the midst of hundreds of witnesses, in the presence of several magistrates who had actually seized some of the offenders in the act, and who had at their command seventy-five policemen, two troops of cavalry, and two companies of infantry,—not a single Orangeman was arrested, or molested in any way whatever!

At a subsequent period, when the Government thought it right to interfere, Mr. Ruthven, the Crown Solicitor, tendered informations against a number of Orangemen, and Mr. Berwick attended to advise the magistrates as to the law; although if any doubt had existed on this point, it could hardly have failed to have been

dispelled by the discussions which had taken place, and the authoritative opinions which had been expressed in the House of Commons and elsewhere, as well as officially by the Irish Attorney-General. Mr. Keown, the brother of the High Sheriff, appeared, however, as counsel for the Orangemen. Five of the magistrates, under these circumstances, were willing to receive the informations; but the course of justice, which in other parts of Ireland is sometimes arrested by accomplices on the jury, was turned aside at the Castlewellsan petty sessions, by accomplices on the Bench. Lord Roden himself came to the rescue, accompanied, we grieve to say, by three clergymen, — Mr. Annesley, Mr. Forde, and Mr. Johnston, — who had not attended the previous investigation; and these gentlemen being, according to their own confession, ignorant of the law, and preferring to be guided by their own ignorance rather than by the eminent advice at their command, outvoted the others, and refused to accept the informations!

It is painful to say that worse than even this remains behind. We should have thought that, although the madness of party might have led men into unjustifiable actions, and even into an open evasion of the law, yet that the ordinary feelings of gentlemen, and, we must add, of clergymen, might have in this instance occasioned some little compunction, and have induced them to cast a veil over these excesses, and to give to the poor Roman Catholic peasantry some thin excuse for bearing with patience their unredressed wrongs. But the victory (for that is the word used by an Orange clergyman, Mr. Drew,) of Dolly's Brae would have lost half its charms, had any such feelings been allowed to temper the full-blown triumph of the Orange party.

On the day week after the burning of Magheramayo, on the second day after the magisterial inquiry which taught the Ribbonmen the precise amount of protection to life and property afforded to them by the law as administered at the Castlewellsan petty sessions, a grand Orange dinner was given to the hero of the day, the Grand Master of the County Down Orangemen, Mr. William Beers. No pains were spared to do him honour. The Seneschal of Downpatrick gave the use of the Manor Court House: a hundred guests sat down to dinner; Mr. Maxwell of Finnebrogue (another magistrate, by the way,) hurried from a Church Education Society to join in the festivity; and the chair was filled by Mr. Keown, the High Sheriff of the county. No cloud seems to have dimmed the gaiety of the evening: no one cared to consider what at that moment was passing in the minds of the villagers of Magheramayo, mourning over their murdered relatives, the poor idiot, the

inoffensive man, the young boy, the aged woman, and contemplating the blackened ruins of their cottages, and the ground strewn with the remnants of their little property wantonly destroyed. Or, if such thoughts occurred, they were soon dispersed by the music of 'The Protestant Boys,' and the triumphant cheering which greeted the 'Glorious, pious, and immortal 'Memory.' Grace was said by the Rev. Mr. Breakey, who seems to have thought it better to rejoice with those that rejoice, than to weep with those that weep. The High Sheriff gave the toast of the evening, 'William Beers, Esq., our County 'Grand Master, with nine times nine, and the Kentish fire;' and then this gentleman, thoroughly appreciating the taste of his hearers, and encouraged by their sympathy, delivered the following speech; which, remembering the time, place, and circumstances, we think absolutely unparalleled.

'He thanked them for the high honour conferred upon them by their entertainment of that evening. If consistency to his principles were the cause of it, he did claim that he had been consistent to his principles as an Orangeman; but he regretted that he had not done as much for the cause as his feelings had dictated. They had only lately celebrated the anniversary of the 12th of July, and such an anniversary as it would have been, *only for the little blot, if blot he could call it.* No; it was a treacherous attempt to betray innocent Protestants of the district; he had been well aware of the plots which had been got up against them, but knew that God was with them. There was nothing contemplated by their enemies but murder and treachery — only think of 1000 men attacking 25. What would have saved them? only they had God directing them,' &c.

On this oration we cannot trust ourselves to say one single word. The audience, however, seem to have highly approved of it, for it was received, according to the Downpatrick Recorder, with loud and continued cheering.\*

One more incident and we pass from this part of our subject. Where, as in Ireland, the spirit of party is so much stronger

---

\* In order to prove that this was not a mere after-dinner effusion, Mr. W. Beers published in the Newry Telegraph, of the 21st September, a letter to the Protestants of Ireland, in which he goes still farther. He no longer affects the slight compunction indicated by the words 'a little blot,' but speaks of 'extermination,' and of 'the contemptible ruffians whose defeat and capture are things to be *gloried in*, and to be *thankful for*.' The letter is curious as a specimen of the last extreme of partisanship and falsehood: but we only notice it as showing Mr. Beers' opinion of what is expected from him by his Orange friends: whether they will justify and adopt his opinions by retaining him as their representative and Grand Master, remains to be seen.

than the love of justice, complaints of packed juries are frequent; and, however unreasonably, people think it important to have a Sheriff of their way of thinking. It was therefore an encouraging fact that the Orange dinner was presided over by the High Sheriff; and the vice-chairman, Mr. Ellis, Grand Master of the Newry Orangemen, took care to bring it prominently forward, saying that 'they ought to be proud to see at their table the first officer of the county;'—a sentiment to which Mr. Keown, 'as Chief Magistrate,' promptly responded. But it may be doubted whether all this tends to create confidence in the pure administration of justice; and whether a Magheramayo man is to be blamed for distrusting a sheriff who is brother-in-law of the County Grand Master, presides over an Orange dinner, and is one of those who hail with loud and continued cheers Mr. W. Beers' opinion, that, when committed by Orangemen against Roman Catholics, robbery, burglary, fire raising, and murder, are only 'a little blot, if blot he could call it.'

Such are the principal facts of this case; but as pains have been taken to fix the blame upon any one except the parties really culpable, we think it incumbent upon us to make a few remarks. And first of all it is asserted, that since the expiration of the Party Processions' Act, Orange processions are legal; and, the procession being legal, the evils which followed the procession ought in justice to be attributed to the individuals who provoked the actual contest, and not to the Orangemen, who were interrupted in the peaceable exercise of their legal rights. Even assuming this to be true, it would be no excuse for the burnings and murders; for these were perpetrated by one set of men in one place, while the actual contest was carried on by other sets of men in another place. But there is no question raised as to the general illegality of Orange processions; it is confined to the illegality of this particular procession. An Orange procession is not *per se* illegal; it may be injudicious, or mischievous, even contrary to the spirit of the law, but it is not necessarily illegal, any more than a procession of Quakers. But an Orange meeting or any other meeting *becomes illegal*, when the accompanying circumstances are such as to cause terror in the minds of ordinary persons. As the Orange party profess to despise Mr. Berwick's statement of the common law on this point, we will quote that given by Mr. Justice Bayley in 1820, on the occasion of the trial of Hunt at York: 'An assembly of great numbers of persons, which from its general appearance and accompanying circumstances is calculated to excite terror, alarm, and consternation, is generally *criminal and unlawful*.' Great numbers, or strong excitement, are elements of terror, and, according to their degree,



may constitute illegality; but the plainest of all tests, because it is one of fact and not of degree (which is necessarily open to a difference of opinion), is the *presence of arms*, especially fire-arms. A large armed assembly, whatever its actual conduct, or whatever its purpose, is necessarily and undoubtedly illegal. Such is the common law of the land; and it is irrelevant to speak of the Party Processions' Act, as if the common law was altered because that has expired: or of the absence of a special proclamation, which is only a warning, and in no way affects the legality or illegality of the assembly. An Orange meeting may be open to the charge of illegality on the ground of the general excitement, the selection of a particular route with the foreknowledge and because it was 'the bone of contention,' or from the anticipation of a collision, and the actual alarm felt at the time; but the display of fire-arms put beyond all doubt or question the illegality both of the Orange procession to Tollymore Park and of the assembly of Ribbonmen at Dolly's Brae. That real alarm was felt and real apprehension prevailed of a serious breach of the peace, is sufficiently proved by the representations made to Dublin, the repeated attempts to induce the Orangemen to take the level road, and the assemblage of a large military and police force. Lord Roden must pardon us if here we use the words of Mr. Justice Holroyd (Lancaster Assizes, 1822,) in speaking of unlawful assemblies: 'All persons who form an assembly of this kind, disregarding its *probable effect*, and the alarm and consternation that are *likely to ensue*, and all who give countenance and support to it, are criminal parties.'

Of those who maintain that the Irish Executive ought to have issued a proclamation prohibiting this procession, we would ask, what was Lord Clarendon to prohibit? The procession?—It was not in itself illegal. The passing by Dolly's Brae?—The Queen's highway is open to all. The carrying of fire-arms?—That is an offence by the common law. He might as well have prohibited the murder and arson which followed.

Besides, in this country, where the right of holding public meetings is one of the most valued safeguards of our freedom, there has always been a great jealousy of the Government taking upon itself beforehand to usurp the essential functions of the justices of the peace, by authoritatively pronouncing on the legality of an intended meeting. Circumstances may occasionally justify and even demand such a step; but the local authorities, having the best means of knowing the state of their district, are in general the most suitable persons to decide whether a meeting may safely be held or ought to be prevented; and the wisest and most constitutional course for the executive is, to avoid in-

terference; while they supply the local magistracy with a sufficient force to compel obedience to whatever decision they may form. Undoubtedly, however, such a line of policy presupposes that the magistrates have some knowledge of the common law, and an honest intention to act up to their duty in enforcing it for the preservation of the public peace. And, unquestionably it is a great aggravation of the misconduct of these parties and their abettors, that they bring in question the policy of such forbearance, and endanger the lawful exercise of our constitutional rights.

The Government has been called upon, especially by Lord Castlereagh, to re-enact the Party Processions Act. The official position of Lord Castlereagh as Lord Lieutenant and member for the county of Down, and his social position as the son of the Marquis of Londonderry and son-in-law to Lord Roden, entitle his opinion to consideration. The Act he wishes for, it must be admitted, is to a certain extent an evil. It establishes a distinction between England and Ireland; it tends to cramp one of our most valued privileges; it restricts one part of Ireland because another is disturbed; it creates an artificial offence, the juror having sometimes to condemn as illegal what he does not consider morally wrong; it is exceedingly difficult and uncertain in its application; it is sometimes inefficient when most wanted, though always available as an engine of oppression; and, finally, it has been remonstrated against as unnecessary and insulting, by every party in Ireland. The common law is strong enough to put down riotous assemblies and processions. But Lord Castlereagh would go farther; and, refusing to the local magistrates the exercise of their discretion, would make all party processions punishable, whether a breach of the peace was to be apprehended or not. Such a measure may perhaps be necessary; Lord Castlereagh thinks that it is,—so great is the evil of party processions. He, in fact, is convinced that the Orange magistracy have not sufficient good sense and good feeling to put down of their own accord this great evil; but must be coerced to do so, by the strong hand of an express enactment! He may be right. But it is very discouraging to Ireland's best friends to find the Tory Lord Lieutenant of the county of Down calling upon a Whig government to pass a special coercive law, directed, not against the ignorant peasantry of the south and west, but against the high Tory aristocracy of the north! It is a standing complaint that England is compelled to rule Ireland because Ireland will not rule herself. Here is a case in point. The English Government is reluctant, perhaps to a fault, to propose a repressive measure which the

Irish people have not called for. But party-spirit begins to show itself in a well-known and threatening shape. The gentry of the north fan the flame, until at length symptoms of something like civil war appear; and then, instead of using their powerful influence to quell the spirit they have evoked with its long train of baneful consequences, they with one voice call upon the English Government to pass additional laws, and by force to repress that system of party demonstrations which they have themselves so sedulously fostered.

The truth is, that Ireland does not require additional laws; but that the existing ones should be firmly and impartially administered. If the natural aristocracy of the country, who in their respective districts guide the public opinion, would honestly discourage all party processions, and every thing which tends to irritate people's minds and to breed disturbance, the law would receive that moral support which renders it irresistible, and the absence of which is ill supplied by special enactments. Instead of this, however, the Orange Society paralyses the action of the law; not only by the open resistance of its partisans, but still more by the tone of feeling which it encourages. It is but too plain from a perusal of these documents, that there was a tacit understanding among all the principal actors, that no Orangeman was to be punished; that the force sent by the Government to support the law was to be used to protect the illegal procession from interruption. To the Roman Catholics it must have appeared that the Government had united with the Orangemen to inflict a wanton insult upon them, and to punish them if they dared to resent it; and this explains their readiness to fire upon the police. The Orange leaders were no doubt desirous of avoiding bloodshed and wrecking; but their followers were quite aware that their efforts would not go beyond persuasion; they were to be coaxed and petted into obedience, if possible,—but were safe from punishment.

The loyalty of the Ulster Orangemen has been made the subject of infinite boasting. It led them in 1836 to dissolve their society, but it did not restrain them from re-organising it in 1845. We admit that they are not repealers, nor followers of Mr. S. O'Brien; but the loyalty which consists in not seeking to dismember the empire to their own ruin, and in not joining in a rebellion of which they would be the first victims, is not so preeminently meritorious as to warrant so much self-laudation. It is, we trust, not necessary that Orangemen should be enrolled in lodges and marched in processions, to prevent them from turning traitors. So long as loyalty is accompanied by ascendancy we

hear a great deal of it; but let any measure trench upon their fancied privileges, and the Reverend Dr. Drew, an Orangeman of some note, and a speaker at Lord Massareene's meeting, declares, without any circumlocution, 'that his loyalty is *conditional*.' Or let a rate-in-aid threaten their pockets, loyalty is put away for a more convenient season, and 'resistance' is the word. Lord Roden, with characteristic caution in his language, recommended constitutional and calm but persevering and determined agitation. The Marquis of Downshire wrote that 'it was one thing to strike a rate, and another to collect it.' But Lord Massareene, the great patron of the Antrim Orangemen, hoisted the Repeal Flag: 'It would take 500,000 men to collect this rate. I dare them to collect it, (cheers) if they do not wish to repudiate the connexion between the two countries.'

It is a great misfortune that the Orange Society is in alliance with what is called the Protestant party of Ireland. The distinctive characteristic of this party is now, as it always was, not so much Christianity as Anti-Catholicism\*; but its votaries conceive that the former is necessarily indicated in the latter. If there is one thing more certain than another to corrupt religion, and by corrupting it to weaken its power for all good, it is an alliance with a political sect. The political power which it then shares, uniformly acts as a poison. The strength and glory of Christianity are in its moral influence, and never was its progress so rapid as when it trusted to that alone. It had neither

---

\* The wise and just principles on which our Indian administration is carried on, are surely as applicable to Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland, as to Christians and Heathens in India; and the peace of both countries is almost equally interested in their recognition. In a note to the chapter on offences relating to religion and caste, the Indian Law Commissioners observe: 'Every man should be suffered to profess his own religion; and no man should be suffered to insult the religion of another. The question, whether insults offered to a religion ought to be visited with punishment, does not appear at all to depend on the question, whether that religion be true or false. The religion may be false; but the pain which such insults give to the professors of that religion is real. It is often, as the most superficial observation may convince us, as real a pain, and as acute a pain, as is caused by almost any offence against the person, against property, or against character. Nor is there any compensating good whatsoever, to be set off against this pain. Discussion, indeed, tends to elicit truth, but insults have no such tendency. When directed against erroneous opinions, they seldom have any other effect than to fix those opinions deeper, and to give a character of peculiar ferocity to theological discussion: instead of eliciting truth, they only inflame fanaticism.'—*Indian Penal Code*.

political power nor wealth when it overthrew Paganism and wounded Romanism. External violence is the last thing it need fear; its foes are they of its own household. The Anglo-Irish Church fears the diatribes of Dr. M'Hale and the political power of the Roman Catholic priests; but she ought indeed to tremble when her ministers harangue Orange processions, and cheer Mr. Beers' speeches. If she neglect to fulfil her true mission of being a living example of faith working by love, and clings to those allies who offer to her the idols of political power and ascendancy, anchoring her establishment upon the strength of England, instead of winning by personal kindness the hearts of the Irish people, her fate is sealed; her pure creed and orthodox ritual will not save her; the faith without the works of the Gospel will be accounted dead; man cannot and God will not protect her.

The influence of the Orange Society for evil is so great, that we look with some anxiety to the future condition of the north of Ireland. The number of illegal processions and party demonstrations, both Orange and Ribbon, were in 1847 only 21, but in 1848 they rose to 101, and in 1849 to no less than 155, of which 79 took place in the month of July.

If the Orange leaders persist in stimulating their followers, this organisation will go on increasing. Along with their numbers the irritation will augment. The murders and wreckings of Magheramayo will be repeated on a wider scale. The country will gradually fall into a chronic state of civil war, restrained only by main force from breaking out into hostilities. To terminate such a state of things the Government can do little; they may pass acts of parliament and dismiss magistrates; they may repress the outward symptoms, but the disease itself will remain. The Orangemen may, on the other hand, avoid much of the illegality of their present proceedings, but they will not thereby get rid of the evil. Outward conformity to the letter of the law will not remove the real mischief of these exclusive associations,—the heart-burnings, the strife, the revengeful spirit which they engender. The only persons capable of securing tranquillity are the gentry of the country. What the Processions' Act failed to do, the voluntary dissolution of the Orange Society in 1836 effectually accomplished. The resolution to dissolve was a wise and good one: that a different one will be persisted in now, we cannot bring ourselves to believe.\*

---

\* In the 'Times,' of November the 1st, 1849, is an account of the proceedings of a meeting of the Ulster Protestant Association at Belfast. The Marquis of Downshire was in the chair, and, taking up

What, in such a contingency, is to become of the administration of justice? It is a plain rule of common sense that it ought not to be trusted to violent partisans. Magistrates, whether Orangemen or Repealers, have been struck off the Commission of the Peace, not because there was anything illegal in the profession of Orange or Repeal principles, but because they could not be trusted to administer justice where their own political adherents were implicated. This principle, when applied to Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers, has received the sanction of the country, with hardly an exception beyond the circle of their immediate friends and partisans. The precedent, commending itself to every man's innate sense of right, cannot

---

the legal branch of the subject, he told the meeting that 'no law' could be a law unless it was a *statute law*. We acquit the Marquis of any intentional misrepresentation; and are no longer surprised at his ignorance of the provisions of the *common law*,—since he is confessedly unaware of its existence. The meeting appeared to acquiesce in the doctrine of their great legal luminary. Mr. Blackwood Price reasserted, amid cheers, that Lord Clarendon had armed the loyal (*i.e.* Protestant) people last year,—although half the meeting were aware that the assertion was contrary to fact. The Dean of Ardagh shed tears over the battle of the Boyne—and complained that his recommendations for preferment were not attended to now as they used to be. We fear there was some mistake here, and that the Dean cried at the wrong place. He also highly commended a young lady for cutting up her under petticoat to supply wadding to an Orange Lodge at Dolly's Brae. This produced great cheering,—but the eulogium sounds oddly in the mouth of a Christian minister;—and if young ladies will pervert their under petticoats from their accustomed office, we would suggest binding up wounds, not inflicting them.

The Rev. Mr. Mac Illwaine was for going to war at once,—the sooner the better;—'he would rather meet death gloriously in the 'battle field,' &c.; and then gave a decent and necessary hint to his Sovereign,—'if the Queen should take it into her head to become a 'Papist, the people should request her to leave the throne.' (Cheers.) The Archdeacon of Dromore declared that 'if a Popish rebellion 'raged outside Ulster, not a Protestant sword would be drawn to put 'it down.' A declaration certainly indicative of a *very conditional* loyalty.

Lord Roden must be highly gratified by being placed in the same category with Mr. W. Beers; and united with him in the sympathising resolutions of such friends as these. But into what ditch will not people fall who blindly take their notions of loyalty from the Archdeacon of Dromore, of forbearance from the Rev. Mr. Mac Illwaine, and of the proper use of under petticoats from the Dean of Ardagh? who take their facts from Mr. Price, and their law from the Marquis of Downshire!

be reversed; governments may or may not be slow in following it; but, with or without their assent, it will grow into a fixed rule. Mr. F. C. Beers, with a twilight sense of propriety, put on his Orange ribbon as he entered Tollymore Park, and removed it again on leaving it. But a man cannot divest himself of his feelings as quickly as of his ribbons. The action, however, was symbolical of a true principle, and impartial men will insist on its application. Mr. Beers thought that an Orange rosette ought not to be seen upon a magistrate's coat,—they will think that an Orange magistrate ought not to be seen upon the Bench.

The time selected for this Orange manifestation has been particularly infelicitous. The repeal party is broken up; and in other parts of Ireland party-spirit is dead. The four years' famine has compelled people to turn their thoughts from political agitation to social and economical questions; and there is an increasing feeling that the well-being of Ireland depends less upon the peculiar constitution of her government than upon the cultivation of her soil,—proper relations between landlord and tenant, the pure administration of justice, and that general tranquillity without which capital cannot accumulate. The Irish Roman Catholic party, however, no doubt remains: but it is now a party without any strong principle of coherence or present object. It is held together very much by the traditional feeling of exclusion from the pale of the British constitution, the unparalleled position of their church, and the singular circumstance of seven eighths of a nation having been ousted, in consequence of their religious belief, from the possession of the soil of their country. But though the land is held by the Protestants, the bulk of the personal property is in the hands of Roman Catholics; and one of the indirect effects of the famine will be to correct this unhealthy distribution. Under a pecuniary pressure, affecting directly the owners of the soil, estates will pass from them to the owners of personal property; and the two descriptions of property will be more equally divided between the religious parties. But when the tendency of the dispensations of Providence is thus to efface the line of demarcation in temporal matters between Roman Catholic and Protestant — when a party forming seven eighths of the population of the island, and holding the greater part of the personal property, is on the point of acquiring their share of territorial possessions, with the political power arising out of them, how suicidal is the effort of the Orange party to affect a religious ascendancy, — to claim an almost exclusive right to power, while they show their unfitness to use it, — to place themselves in perpetual hostility to the overwhelming majority of their country-

men,—to irritate them, to the utmost, without weakening their strength,—and to drive them to unite and to concentrate their political efforts upon one object, while by their own conduct they repel the support of all moderate people.

Orangemen may, perhaps, despise the temperate language used by Lord John Russell in 1836, and may resent the settled policy of his government in 1849; but to neglect also the opinion of Lord Stanley and Sir Robert Peel, and act in opposition to the advice of the leaders of every party, can hardly be wise. Lord Stanley's advice to the North Lancashire Association applies with tenfold force to the Orange Association.

‘Could the ingenuity of man suggest a source more certain to send forth bitter waters than the spirit which will be engendered by the establishment of your association? All the arguments of self-defence,—all the reasoning by which, as from an overpowering necessity, you justify a deviation from the ordinary channels in which political feeling diffuses itself and evaporates,—pass at once to the side of your opponents. They are those whom it is sought to oppress by combination—they are those who appeal to the sympathy of the country for the maintenance of freedom of conscience. Beware, for your own sakes, how you remove one cause of their weakness—beware of forcing them, for the sake of resisting your aggressions, to forget their own differences—beware how you organise the whole country in such a manner that every man must become a partisan.’

Sir R. Peel, in 1844, after expressing his earnest hope that agitation in Ireland, and all its evil consequences, might be permitted to subside, gave utterance to feelings which he shared in common with his political opponents, in the following language:—

‘I should consider *that* the happiest day of my life when I could see the beloved sovereign of these realms fulfilling the fondest wishes of her heart—I should hail the dawning of that auspicious day when she could alight, like some benignant spirit, on the shores of Ireland, and lay the foundations of a Temple of Peace! when she could, in accents which proceeded from the heart, spoken to the heart rather than to the ear, call upon her Irish subjects of all classes and of all denominations, Protestants and Roman Catholics, Saxon and Celt, to forget the difference of creed and of race, and to hallow that Temple of Peace which she should then found,—with sacrifices still holier than those by which the temples of old were hallowed, by the sacrifice of those evil passions that dishonour our common faith.’



One part of the vision has been realised: the auspicious day arrived. Commanding the respect of her subjects by her virtues, and winning their love by her goodness, the Queen, surrounded by those family affections which so gracefully temper the majesty of her regal state, and which clinging round the throne as to their natural home, adorn and hallow it with the soft influences of domestic life, did set foot on the shores of Ireland. The gentle accents from her lips did breathe peace to the land, and amidst bursts of heartfelt acclamations from the Irish nation, the first stone of the Temple was laid. So far the statesman's prayer was granted,—‘The rest,’ alas!

‘The rest the winds dispersed in empty air.’

Can we say that the sovereign found a sacrifice of evil passions? A few short weeks before, there had indeed been officiating priests, and victims, and a sacrifice,—But the victims were the peasants of Dolly's Brae, and the smoke of the sacrifice rose from the cabins of Magheramayo.

But we will not even now despond. To have allowed Lord Roden to have remained on the Bench would have been to sanction a denial of justice: in removing him the Government have fulfilled a plain duty and done their part. But here their power ceases. The fate of Ireland is in her own hands. The peaceful manner in which the fifth of November passed over, is a clear proof that the Orange leaders can secure tranquillity without additional laws, when they choose to exert that influence which they undoubtedly possess, although at times it suits their purposes to disclaim it. The conduct of parties in that country is narrowly watched by impartial men in this, whose sympathies are with the oppressed, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and whose aid will be given to whichever party is most ready to sacrifice its evil passions, and unite in building the Temple of Peace—but will join heart and hand against those, who prefer the prosecution of their party feuds to the tranquillity of their common country.

ART. IV.—*History of Greece*. By GEORGE GROTE, Esq.  
Vols. III. and IV. 1847. Vols. V. and VI. 1849. 8vo.

IN a former Number of this Journal (No. clxx.) we reviewed the two first volumes of this work; they were for the most part introductory, and only just entered the historical period. Mr. Grote has since completed a large portion of his undertaking, by the publication of four additional volumes; in which,

after relating what is known of the political origin of each Grecian state, he has described the Persian Wars, with the foundation of the Athenian Empire; and has brought down the historical narrative to the Peace of Nicias, which terminated the first act of the Peloponnesian War.

We return to this work with a full consciousness of the importance and interest of the subject—as well as of the undiminished ability with which it has been treated by Mr. Grote. As the subject expands, and the drama develops itself, Mr. Grote has proved himself equal to the height of his great argument. He has shown that he can tell the true story of remote times, as well as discuss their mythological legends,—that he can set real men in motion, and paint the stirring life of the numerous Grecian communities, as well as analyse the patriotic and religious fictions which envelope the primitive ages of Hellas.

Before we proceed to the examination of the volumes before us, we may be permitted to say that we have but small respect for that method which attempts to reduce history to a set of algebraic symbols; which accounts for all events by a law of necessary sequences; and suppressing, as far as it can, the names of individual men, and even of nations, deduces the progress of society from a set of metaphysical entities, such as Paganism, Catholicism, Feudality, Monarchy, Democracy, and the like. The history of each nation is always, in reality, specifically different from that of every other nation: And no general formula, or type, of successive states of society, following each other in a constant and invariable series, will suit Hindostan and Greece, Egypt and Germany. Nevertheless there is a certain broad current of universal history, to which the minor streams converge, and which represents the movement of the most advanced and civilised portion of mankind. At the head of this current, and as its highest, purest, and most copious source, stands the history of ancient Greece. The Religion of the civilised world, indeed, derives its ultimate origin from Judaism\*; but with this exception, the beginnings of all our intellectual civilisation,—of our poetry, music, history, oratory, sculpture, painting, and architecture; of our logical, metaphysical, ethical,

---

\* It ought not to be forgotten that Christianity, though not locally of Grecian origin, is inseparably connected with the Greek language; and that the earliest churches out of the Holy Land, were those in the Hellenised portions of Asia Minor and in Greece Proper. Besides which, the systematic development of Christian doctrine was exclusively due to Greeks, and to persons imbued with Grecian discipline.

political, mathematical, and physical science, and of our free political institutions, must be traced to the Greeks. They are preeminently the intellectual aristocracy of the human race. No other nation can ever do for mankind what they did. They found the world immersed in all the darkness of the oriental form of society. Despotie governments, enforcing abject submission to the sovereign, and a prohibition of open discussion in assemblies of chiefs or counsellors; exclusive priesthoods, predominating over the people; in private life, polygamy; cruel punishments and bodily mutilations; art massive, shapeless, and grotesque; the absence of all literature-worthy of the name; no science, no oratory, no drama; no history, beyond a meagre chronicle of the genealogies and acts of the kings:—such was the state of the most civilised portion of mankind when the influence of the Greek genius began to operate upon the inert mass. It was this which first infused a soul into the lifeless body—it was the Greek Prometheus who stole from heaven the fire which illuminated and warmed these benighted races: and it was under its excitement that they made the first great step out of the stationary into the progressive state; that step, of which all experience proves the extreme difficulty, even when there is a model at hand, to work upon. Lagrange said that Newton was a fortunate man, for that there was only one system of the world to discover. We may in like manner say of the Greeks that they were a fortunate nation, for that the advance from oriental barbarism to occidental civilisation could only be once made.

When the Greek preeminence had ceased, the Romans succeeded to the headship of civilisation. Their political and military achievements, and their systematic jurisprudence, together with Christianity, their subsequently adopted religion, give its character and colour to the civilisation of the world for many successive centuries. After the extinction of the Roman Empire, the only history which has any living importance in the modern world, and which has an interest beyond the knowledge of facts, appear to us to be that of England, and her colonies the United States of America. Every other civilised state has broken the link which might have connected it with the past. In the existing state of Europe its political institutions are not due to a native or spontaneous development; but are merely copied from the representative systems of England or America. At the utmost, one copy serves as a model for another; and the continental governments are never cited as independent examples: while the only foreign constitution which is ever held up to the imitation of England, is that peculiar form of its own colonial

government, which has been moulded, by native and coherent changes, into the constitution of the United States. In general terms, therefore, it may be said that the great chain of universal history, so far, at least, as the political state of the world is concerned, is formed of three links,—of which the first is Greece, the second Rome, and the third England with her colonies. In a series, where every term is necessary, it is difficult to assign a preference; but it may be safely pronounced, that the history of that nation which originated our civilisation, cannot be second to any other in its claims upon our attention.

Independently, however, of the undying interest which attaches to the Greeks as the true authors of nearly all the characteristic elements of European progress, Grecian history, considered as a drama, is scarcely, if at all, surpassed by any other. Its beginnings, though illustrated by the divine genius of Homer, are lost in fable; and when authentic history dawns upon us, the attention is distracted by numerous small independent communities, moving in almost parallel lines. Its conclusion, moreover, is not only mournful but inglorious. It falls by internal divisions: and it throws out its last offshoots into semi-oriental states. But from the time when Sparta, and afterwards Athens, obtain and exercise the ascendancy in Greece, the narrative of Grecian history proceeds with rapid and unbroken interest. What history, regarded merely as a dramatic composition, can surpass, or even rival, the series of events from the Messenian wars to the death of Alexander?

In estimating the merits of Mr. Grote's history, it is natural to compare him with the many able and learned writers who have of late years explored every portion of Greek antiquity, and whose researches are essential to the modern student: And on such a comparison, it appears to us, that to a learning as sound and comprehensive as that of his German predecessors, he unites a more sober and correct judgment than, as a class, they possess. The general character of the most eminent German writers on antiquity is, that they are sceptical as to received facts, but credulous as to their own hypotheses, or the favoured hypotheses of some of their own school. They reject, and often with perfect justice, accredited legends and fables; but they substitute unauthorised imaginations of their own. Hence, although admirable, not merely as collectors of materials, but as suggesting new and ingenious speculations, they are dangerous guides to a blind follower.\* Mr. Grote, adopting much of the

---

\* 'Carlstadt belonged to a class of men, not uncommon in Germany, who combine with a natural turn for deep speculation the boldness to

negative side of their criticism, is laudably careful to keep within the evidence as to the affirmative; and to avoid the temptation which besets the inquirer into Greek antiquity, of filling up from conjecture the numerous and wide chasms in the records which have been preserved. He therefore performs the primary duty of an historian, in being a trustworthy guide for the facts of his narrative, neither chargeable with the shallowness which characterises the English historians of Greek antiquity, with the exception of Dr. Thirlwall, nor infected by the fondness for bold hypotheses, and the tendency to go beyond the evidence, which distinguishes the modern German school. Besides which, the German writers upon antiquity, being chiefly professors, and passing their time in learned seclusion, have never, like Mr. Grote, come into actual contact with the realities of political life, nor learned from personal experience the nature of a popular deliberative body. In addition to these qualifications, Mr. Grote has surveyed society, both past and present, with a philosophic eye; he is familiar with all the modern doctrines of political science, and he brings to bear upon antiquity the accumulated experience of subsequent ages. Whereas in Germany sciences, like trades, are usually divided; and a scholar or philologist is rarely conversant with the principles or practice of politics. We ought not to omit that he has formed a high estimate of the duties of an historian, — that he fully recognises the responsibility which a writer assumes who undertakes to lay before the public a recital of historical facts and events, — and that he has spared no effort — by conscientious industry, and a most careful examination of the books, whether original sources or modern comment and criticism, which bear upon his subject — to frame a veracious and well-attested narrative.

With respect to Mr. Grote's treatment of the legendary portion of his subject we shall, after what has been said in a former Number, only make one remark, directed against what seems to us a prevalent misunderstanding of the nature of the criticism on which it is founded. Those who reject the historical character of the primitive periods of Greece and Rome, and believe the early narratives to be merely mythical, are often blamed for their *antipoetical* tendency; for reducing history to a dry skeleton, and depriving it of its ornamental and graceful appendages.

---

reject all that has been established, or to maintain all that has been condemned; yet without feeling the necessity of first arriving at any clear and precise ideas, or of resting those ideas upon arguments fitted to carry general conviction.' — *Ranke's Reformation in Germany*, vol. ii. p. 19. *Mrs. Austin's Translation*.

Hence Wordsworth's sonnet at Rome, containing his regrets at the theories of Niebuhr, and other modern historians:—

‘Those old credulities, to nature dear,  
Shall they no longer bloom upon the stock  
Of history, stript naked as a rock  
Mid a dry desert? What is it we hear?  
The glory of infant Rome must disappear,  
Her morning splendours vanish, and their place  
Know them no more. If Truth, who veiled her face  
With those bright beams yet hid it not, must steer  
Henceforth a humbler course perplexed and slow;  
One solace yet remains for us who came  
Into this world in days when story lacked  
Severe research, that in our hearts we know  
How, for exciting youth's heroic flame,  
Assent is power, belief the soul of fact.’

Now it appears to us that this view is not only not true, but is the very reverse of the truth. It is not those who treat the early legends as fabulous, but those who treat them as historical, against whom the charge of a prosaic and anti-poetical spirit can be justly made. The former reproduce them in their genuine, antique simplicity, without suppressing the marvellous incidents, or reducing them to an arbitrary modern standard of probability. The latter eliminate all the supernatural or improbable circumstances of the story, and, after having passed it through their alembic, present the *caput mortuum* to their readers, as a narrative worthy of belief. This is the process at which Ephorus and his followers were so expert; and of which all the later and more philosophical writers of antiquity contain abundant examples. If anybody believes that this mode of treating the early legends is poetical, we entreat him to compare the history of Dictys of Crete with the Homeric and legendary accounts of the Trojan war. If we are not mistaken, he will rise from the perusal, with the conviction that the corruption of fine poetry may engender very bad history. The rationalising school of historians taught that Troy was battered by an engine called a *horse*, as the Roman battering engine was called a *ram*; or that it was taken in a skirmish of cavalry; that the dragon's teeth of Cadmus were, in fact, imported ivory, with which Cadmus, a rich Phœnician trader, hired an army of mercenaries; that the voyage of the Argonauts after the Golden Fleece was a military expedition, under the command of Jason, for the conquest of a country enriched by the golden sands of its rivers. The early Roman history was treated in like manner. The marvellous incident of the she-wolf which nursed the god-like twins, was reconciled with probability by adding that they

were in reality brought up by a *courtesan* (in Latin, *lupa*)\*: And all the other picturesque and poetical features of the old legend are, by a similar process, transmuted into the common-place and vulgar events of every-day life. If the received histories reproduced the legends in their original traditional form, and presented them for our acceptance as literal facts, it might be said that the rejection of them as history is unpoetical: but a refusal to accept the rationalised and modernised version as historical, surely cannot be considered as the mark of a prosaic spirit. Those who pursue this method treat the legends of primitive story as Tacitus treats the phoenix. Stript of his picturesque and striking features, he is no longer the 'secular bird of ages' who carries his father's body, enveloped in myrrh, to be burnt on the altar of the sun. But instead of discarding him alto-

---

\* See Plutarch, Rom. c. 4., Livy, i. 4. From this sense of *lupa* was derived the word *lupanar*. In like manner, the infant Cyrus was said to have been exposed and miraculously suckled by a dog: which was softened into the story that he was preserved by a herdsman's wife named *Kuvó*. See Herod. i. 122., and Grote, vol. iv. p. 246. Plutarch, Parallel. c. 36., recites a similar story of the birth of the twin brothers, Lycastus and Parrhasius, mythical kings of Arcadia. The following is the account which the poet Goldsmith gives of the birth of Romulus and Remus. 'Rhea Silvia, going to fetch water from a neighbouring grove, was met and ravished by a man, whom, perhaps to palliate her offence, she averred to be Mars, the god of war. Whoever this lover of hers might have been, whether some person who deceived her by assuming so great a name, or Amulius himself, as some writers affirm, it is impossible to determine; certain it is, that in due time she was brought to bed of two boys, who were no sooner born than devoted by the usurper to destruction. The mother was condemned to be buried alive, the usual punishment for vestals who had violated their chastity, and the twins were ordered to be flung into the river Tyber. It happened, at the time this rigorous sentence was put into execution, that the river had more than usually overflowed its banks, so that the place where the children were thrown, being at a distance from the main current, the water was too shallow to drown them. In this situation, therefore, they continued without harm; and, that no part of their preservation might want its wonders, we are told that they were for some time suckled by a wolf, until Faustulus, the king's herdsman, finding them thus exposed, brought them home to Acca Laurentia, his wife, who nursed them as his own. Some, however, will have it that the nurse's name was Lupa, which gave rise to the story of their being nourished by a wolf; but it is needless to weed out a single improbability from accounts where the whole is overgrown with fable.'—Roman History, c. 1.

gether, Tacitus has no doubt that a bird called the phoenix is seen from time to time in Egypt.\*

Mr. Grote commences the strictly historical portion of his work by a general view of the geography of Greece, and of the Hellenic people. He then passes to the Doric invasion of Peloponnesus; and describes the early state of Sparta and the constitution of Lycurgus, together with the early wars and conquests of the Spartans within the peninsula. We agree with him in rejecting the view promulgated by Otfried Müller in his well-known work on the Dorians, viz., that Sparta was merely the type of the Doric institutions; and in thinking that its system was peculiar to itself, and the result of its own local circumstances. The Spartans were certainly Dorians, who had established themselves by conquest in the midst of a primitive Greek population — Achæan and Lelegian — belonging to a different race. Towards these their subjects they kept up a markedly hostile position; some were retained in absolute slavery; while the rest were excluded from nearly all civil rights. The polity was unequal as regarded the Peræci; and it had this singularity, — the slave class were native Greeks, and not imported barbarians. Now the Doric Spartans were not entrenched in a strong acropolis, whence a despot, with the assistance of a body-guard, or a small band of oligarchs, could exercise their sway over a population of unarmed cultivators. Sparta was an open, unwall'd town on the banks of the Eurotas; protected, indeed, by strong frontiers and a harbourless coast, from foreign attack, but exposed to domestic enemies. Hence, in order that their newly-founded state and exclusive power should continue, a peculiar system was needed. It was necessary that the Spartans should be a community of soldiers — a civil army of occupation — permanently encamped in an enemy's country. They were enabled to fulfil this condition by the institutions of an early legislator, allied to a royal house; of whom, in detail, the later Greeks knew nothing authentic, but to whom the

---

\* Ann. vi. 28. The fullest exemplification of the rationalist method of treating the ancient mythology is to be found in the work of the Abbé Banier, '*La Mythologie et les Fables expliquées par l'Histoire*,' 8 vols. 12mo., a work which went through several editions in the last century, and was translated into English. Dr. Musgrave also, the editor of Euripides, wrote a Dissertation (published after his death, 8vo. 1782) in the same spirit. It may be remarked that the entire body of Greek mythology, as it was known to the literary Greeks, has descended to us. We are, in like manner, fully informed as to their philosophical systems. But much of their history, much authentic contemporary narrative, is irreparably lost.



unanimous voice of posterity attributed the origin of the distinctive laws of Sparta. By what means he induced the Doric aristocracy to submit to the iron discipline by which their entire lives were regulated, we have no means of ascertaining; but the system, having been once established, was perpetuated, partly from habit and a respect for antiquity, — which was omnipotent at Sparta; and partly from a sense of its necessity for maintaining the privileges of the dominant race.

To this source are to be traced all the peculiar institutions of Sparta; and particularly its celebrated *paideia*, or training, which was in fact nothing else than a *drill*. The Spartans despised all literature: they were a sort of military quakers, combining ostentatious simplicity with a steady pursuit of the virtues of the soldier. As Mr. Grote remarks, they did not even learn to read.\* We have a difficulty in conceiving an education which did not comprise reading and writing, and did not even include instruction in Homer, the corner-stone of Greek teaching. Such, however, was their system: it was a training of the body to endurance of hardships, and to the exercises of a military life; not a mental education. All experience proves the efficacy of military training and discipline, against either numbers or courage without organisation and practice. This the Spartans had the sagacity to see; and on account of their position, submitted to the privations necessary for the purpose. They may be compared in many respects with the Romans,—who however did more by organisation and civil government, and less by mere drill. The internal relations of the Romans were sounder; and although they started from a beginning as small as the Spartan state, they were soon able to operate upon a large scale, and their energy was turned more against foreign than domestic enemies. Their capacity, too, was higher, and the results consequently greater.†

The Spartans were stiff, unsocial, dry, austere, illiterate; but their system generated a high spirit of military honour, courage and patriotism, and of mutual reliance; greater even than that of the other Greeks, and contrasting strongly with the military state of the Asiatics and barbarians, and with that imperfect

\* Vol. ii. p. 517. Compare Schoemann, *Jus Publ. Gr.* p. 135. When it is said that Tyrtæus, the poet, was a *schoolmaster* at Sparta; in what sense is this word to be understood? See Grote, vol. ii. p. 569.

† M. Comte, '*Cours de Philosophie Positive*,' tom. v. p. 247., calls the Spartans '*des Romains avortés*.' Compare Veget. de Re Mil. i. 1. upon the effects of the Roman discipline.

discipline which lashed the troops into the fight. The character of the Spartan is so unattractive, that there is a danger now of underrating it too much, as compared with the Athenian. The philosophers, however, fell into the opposite error. Their systematic minds were captivated with the orderliness of the Spartan constitution, and the public recognition of a system of training for all the citizens. They admired the means; and only censured the exclusive devotion of a good system to an unworthy end.

We ought not to quit the subject of the Spartan constitution without noticing Mr. Grote's views upon the regulations attributed to Lycurgus by Plutarch and other writers, with respect to the equal division of lands in Lacedæmon. Mr. Grote has, we think, proved conclusively that these regulations never existed, and that it is an invention of philosophising writers of late times. The hypothesis had been previously advanced in Germany, but had been insufficiently supported, and had met with little success. The detailed argument of Mr. Grote seems to us to have decided the question.

One of the first results of the firm establishment of the military system of Sparta was, its wars with the neighbouring Doric State of Messenia. These wars—as to which our authentic information is very scanty—appear to have originated in some disputes at a border-temple, and certainly ended in the entire subjugation of Messenia, and its incorporation with Laconia. By this territorial acquisition, and by some encroachments on the northern states, Sparta became mistress of about two fifths of Peloponnesus. The Elean, Arcadian, and Achæan cities, however, as well as Argos, always remained substantially independent; and the latter State, mindful of her mythical renown, sullenly recognised the ascendancy of Sparta in all the common affairs of Greece. But as the Spartans (according to the just remark of Aristotle) practised war as an art, and trained themselves to it professionally, at a time when the other Greeks had no systematic military discipline, their preeminence in the field was admitted by all the other States; and about the year 547 B. C., in the reign of Cræsus, Sparta enjoyed, without dispute, the headship of the entire Hellenic body; which she retained until Athens became the leading state in Greece.

Before Mr. Grote commences his account of the Athenian State, he reviews the history of the three neighbouring States of Corinth, Sicyon, and Megara; which affords him an opportunity of illustrating the manner in which the Greeks regarded the government of the *τύραννος*, or despot, as compared with a popular form of government. In these, as in other Grecian

States, the heroic royalty, founded on notions of a divine right, and transmitted in a hereditary line, had, after a time, been weakened and divided among the members of an oligarchy. The heroic king, as he is portrayed in Homer, had large and indefinite powers, both in peace and war; but he was in the habit of recognising some rights co-ordinate with his own in persons near his throne, and of discussing certain questions in a public council or assembly. The transition, therefore, from the primitive heroic royalty to the primitive oligarchy of a few heroic chieftains, was easy and natural.

Out of the bosom of these oligarchies there arose in most of the Greek States, between 650 and 500 B. C., that class of rulers whom the Greeks called *τύραννοι*, or *despots*. The despot was in many cases a demagogue; that is, a leader who espoused the popular cause, and acquired his power by popular support, — but fighting his way to supremacy by his sword, and not acquiring his influence, as in later times, by his power of speech in the popular assembly. Other means were likewise resorted to by rich and powerful men to put down their brother-oligarchs, and establish their exclusive power. Sometimes a despot was enabled to found a dynasty, which lasted for a few generations; but in general the usurpation was of short duration; as it could be maintained only by constant vigilance, and a constant struggle against a reluctant people. Like an oriental despotism, it was founded on naked fear; but, unlike an oriental despotism, the people did not submit tamely to their master. ‘Nothing,’ Thales is supposed to have said, ‘is so rare a sight as an aged despot.’ ‘Of all forms of government,’ said Aristotle, ‘oligarchy and despotism are the most short-lived.’ It was a rare event for an absolute prince to die in his bed.

‘Ad generum Cereris sine cæde et sanguine pauci  
Descendunt reges, et siccâ morte tyranni.’

Contempt of the laws and usages of the country, cruelty, lust and rapacity, were the recognised characteristics of the Greek despot. In general, his relation with his subjects was avowedly hostile; his person was only safe so long as it was protected by a body-guard; and he was perpetually in danger of being overpowered by open attack, or of being stabbed by the dagger of private vengeance. All Grecian antiquity, oligarchs and democrats, the philosophers and the vulgar, were united in their hatred of despots, and their approbation of tyrannicide. Plato, in his eloquent description of the despot's mind, and Aristotle in his exhaustive analysis of his policy, equally bear witness to the antisocial character of his rule. Many of the maxims of

policy in Machiavel's Prince, which have been stamped with the reprobation of the modern civilised world, are literally borrowed from Aristotle's account of the means by which a Greek despotism was preserved: with this difference, however, that what Aristotle describes as facts, Machiavel converts into precepts. Whatever might be the necessity of submission produced by successful usurpation, ancient Greece was unanimous in detesting the irresponsible rule of a single man, and in preferring some form of government in which *several* persons, either the few or the many, bore a part. Upon this state of feeling, Mr. Grote comments as follows:—

“It is important to show that the monarchical institutions and monarchical tendencies prevalent throughout mediæval and modern Europe have been both generated and perpetuated by causes peculiar to those societies; whilst in the Hellenic societies such causes had no place; in order that we may approach Hellenic phenomena in the proper spirit, and with an impartial estimate of the feeling universal among Greeks towards the idea of a *king*. The primitive sentiment entertained towards the heroic king died out; passing first into indifference, next, after experience of the despots, into determined antipathy. To an historian like Mr. Mitford, full of English ideas respecting government, this anti-monarchical feeling appears of the nature of insanity, and the Grecian communities like madmen without a keeper; while the greatest of all benefactors is the hereditary king who conquers them from without; and the second-best is the home despot, who seizes the acropolis, and puts his fellow citizens under coercion. There cannot be a more certain way of misinterpreting and distorting Grecian phenomena than to read them in this spirit; which reverses the maxims both of prudence and morality current in the ancient world. The hatred of *kings* as it stood among the Greeks, (whatever may be thought of a similar feeling now), was a prominent virtue, flowing directly from the noblest and wisest part of their nature. It was a consequence of their deep conviction of the necessity of universal legal restraint; it was a direct expression of that regulated sociality which required the control of individual passion from every one without exception, and ~~not~~ of all from him to whom power was confided. The conception which the Greeks formed of, an irresponsible one, or of a *king who could do no wrong*, may be expressed in the pregnant words of Herodotus, — “He subverts the customs of the country, — he violates women, — he puts men to death without trial.” No other conception of the probable tendencies of *kingship* was justified either by a general knowledge of human nature, or by political experience as it stood from Solon downward; no other feeling than abhorrence could be entertained for the character so conceived; no other than a man of unprincipled ambition would ever seek to invest himself with it. Our larger political experience has taught us to modify this opinion; by showing that under the conditions of monarchy, in the best governments of modern Europe, the enor-

mities described by Herodotus do not take place: and that it is possible, by means of representative constitutions acting under a certain force of manners, customs, and historical recollections, to obviate many of the mischiefs likely to flow from proclaiming the duty of peremptory obedience to an hereditary and irresponsible king, who cannot be changed without extra constitutional force. But such larger observation was not open to Aristotle, the wisest as well as the most cautious of ancient theorists; nor, if it had been open, could he have applied with assurance its lessons to the governments of the single cities of Greece. *The theory of a constitutional king, especially as it exists in England, would have appeared to him impracticable.* To establish a king who will reign without governing; in whose name all government is carried on, yet whose personal will is in practice of little or no effect; exempt from all responsibility, without making use of the exemption; receiving from every one unmeasured demonstrations of homage, which are never translated into act except within the bounds of a known law; surrounded with all the paraphernalia of power, yet acting as a passive instrument in the hands of ministers marked out for his choice by indications which he is not at liberty to resist. . . . . When the Greeks thought of a man exempt from legal responsibility, they conceived him as really and truly such, in deed as well as in name, *with a defenceless community exposed to his oppressions*; and their fear and hatred of him was measured by their reverence for a government of equal law and free speech, with the ascendancy of which their whole hopes of security were associated; in the democracy of Athens more perhaps than in any other portion of Greece.' (Vol. iii. p. 15—19.)

Agreeing entirely in Mr. Grote's historical representation of the Greek feeling with respect to despotic power, we think that he has in this passage extended it beyond its true limits. It appears to us that, in order to bring it into accordance with fact, *despot or absolute prince* ought to be substituted in this passage, for *king*. For the Greeks certainly made, both in practice and theory, a wide distinction between a βασιλεὺς or king, and a τύραννος, or despot. The former was considered as reigning by an hereditary, in early times a divine title; and as exercising his power according to the established usages of the State; the latter was essentially an usurper, whose power was acquired by force and illegality. 'Omnes habentur et dicuntur tyranni,' (says Cornelius Nepos, in a passage quoted by Mr. Grote,) 'qui potestate sunt perpetuâ in eâ civitate, quæ libertate usa est.' Cromwell and Napoleon may serve as modern examples of the latter class of rulers; Charles I. and Louis XVI. of the former. The theoretical writers, accordingly, mark this distinction in the clearest manner. Thus Xenophon describes Socrates as teaching that a king governed willing subjects according to the laws of the state; whereas a despot ruled over unwilling subjects, and contrary to the laws

of the country.\* Aristotle has treated the subject with great copiousness in his *Politics*, and has left no doubt as to his views. Despotism is, according to him, a perversion or corruption of kingly government. The king looks to the general good of the people; his subjects obey him willingly; his body-guard is of native citizens; he is chosen for his merit from among the good, to protect the better or richer classes; and his object is virtue. The despot looks exclusively to his own interest; his subjects obey him reluctantly; his body-guard is of foreigners; he is generally taken from among the people to protect them against the aristocratic class; and his object is self-enjoyment. A kingly government is destroyed by becoming too despotic; a despotism is saved by being administered in the spirit of a king. He remarks finally that kingly governments were nearly extinct in his time; and that there were then none but despotisms.† Polybius, in like manner, shows in detail how a kingly government passes into a despotism.‡ The distinction between a *rex* and a *tyrannus* was an established subject of disputation in the rhetorical schools.§ The distinction was equally recognised in practice. Thus Sosicles, the Corinthian, about the year 510 B.C., addressing the Spartans at the meeting of Peloponnesian envoys, speaks of the bloodiness and rapacity of despots, wonders how the Spartans can think of restoring the despot Hippias at Athens, and asks them to try the experiment themselves how they like a despotism, before they introduce it elsewhere: Yet there always were *kings* at Sparta. ||

It is true that the *king* was sometimes an absolute monarch, and exercised despotic power,—as was the case with the king of Persia; and hence there is a fluctuation in the phraseology, especially in the Latin writers, who thought of the despotic acts of their king Tarquin. But the Greek kings were not in general absolute, during the historical period; and the Greeks were quite familiar with the conception of king as the honorary *title* of an office, the *powers* of which were variable and indeterminate. It is true that no royal republic, exactly similar to

---

\* Mem. iv. 7. 12. Compare Mr. Grote's account of the position and powers of the heroic king. (Vol. ii. p. 84—93.)

† Polit. iii. 7, 14; iv. 2, 10; v. 10, 11, 12. Eth. Nic. viii. 12. Compare Plat. Rep. ix. p. 576, and a saying of Aristippus, Stob. Floril. tit. 49. n. 18.

‡ VI. 7. Compare Plutarch de Monarchiâ, c. 3; and Dion. A. R. v. 74.

§ Cicero de Orat. iii. 29. Compare De Rep. ii. c. 26.

|| Herod. v. 92. See Grote, iv. 233. *Βασιλεύς* is the title of an office, *κύραρος* is the name of a power.

the English Constitution, existed in Greece; because the representative system was then unknown: But the Greeks had ample experience of kings with limited powers, who reigned without governing, and to whose oppressions no defenceless community was exposed. In the first place, there were the Spartan kings, whose titular preeminence, combined with political subordination, is marked in the strongest colours; there were the Corinthian kings, whose office gradually merged into that of an annual Prytanis, chosen from the reigning family; there were the Argive kings, of whom Mr. Grote observes, that 'their title existed at the time of the Persian war, though probably with very limited functions.' (Vol. ii. p. 611.) At Athens the ancient kingly office dwindled at last into the annual Archon Basileus. Even the Macedonian kings, though their power had much of the ancient indefiniteness, lived upon terms of social equality with the nobles of the court; and Livy dwells with invidious compassion upon the Oriental homage which Alexander only exacted after his mind had been corrupted by non-Hellenic customs. The Roman kings had limited powers, restrained even by the legal check of an appeal to the people from their decisions; and the Roman Empire, as it was constituted by Augustus, had, in its forms and theory, a close resemblance to a modern constitutional monarchy. The Princeps was at the head of the state; and exercised a wide control over the civil and military executive; But all legislative power, and even the appointments of many magistrates, were vested in the Senate and Comitia. As the Senate and Comitia in substance merely represented the population of Rome, the system was unsuited to the territory when extended by conquest from Asia Minor to Spain, and from Gaul to Africa; and it thus soon became, practically, an absolute or despotic monarchy.\* But if the ancients had been acquainted with the representative system, and if the basis of the Roman Assemblies had been enlarged, we see no reason why a sufficient moral and political power should not have been organised to keep the Princeps, or Emperor, within constitutional limits.

Mr. Grote considers the authentic history of Athens as beginning with the Archonship of Creon, 683 B. C. The early kings of Attica were said to have been succeeded by twelve archons for

---

\* The expression of Strabo is remarkable. After reviewing the Roman Empire, he says:—Χαλεπὸν δ' ἄλλως διοικεῖν τὴν τηλικαύτην ἡγεμονίαν ἢ ἐπὶ ἐπιτρέψαντας ὡς πατρί. (vi. 4. § 2.) He considered a *paternal despotism* the only possible form of government for so wide a domain.

life, and the twelve life archons to have been succeeded by seven decennial archons. After these decennial archons came Creon; in whose time the powers of the archonship were distributed among nine archons, elected annually, which institution continued to the latest times. Scarcely anything is known in detail of the events of Athenian history before the time of Solon, about the beginning of the sixth century, B.C. For the earlier period little is ascertained beyond certain political divisions of the people, which have exercised the ingenuity of antiquaries, and given occasion to many discordant explanations. The Athenians were originally divided into four tribes, the ancient names of which (the Hopletes, Ægicoreis, Argadeis, and Geleontes) were common to all the Ionians. But Mr. Grote rejects the hypothesis which considers these tribes as hereditary castes, descriptive of the occupations of the inhabitants. They had a double subdivision—for civil and for religious purposes: the latter consisted of the phratries and gentes; each tribe containing three phratries and ninety gentes. The *genos* or *gens* was an essential idea in the social economy of the ancients, and we therefore extract Mr. Grote's explanation of it.

'The phratries and gentes themselves were real, ancient, and durable associations among the Athenian people, highly important to be understood. The basis of the whole was the house, hearth, or family; a number of which, greater or less, composed the gens or *genos*. This gens was therefore a clan, sept, or enlarged and partly fictitious brotherhood, bound together by—1. Common religious ceremonies, and exclusive privilege of priesthood, in honour of the same god, supposed to be the primitive ancestor, and characterised by a special surname; 2. By a common burial place; 3. By mutual rights of succession to property; 4. By reciprocal obligations of help, defence, and redress of injuries; 5. By mutual right and obligation to intermarry in certain determinate cases, especially where there was an orphan daughter or heiress; 6. By possession, in some cases at least, of common property, an archon, and a treasurer of their own. Such were the rights and obligations characterising the gentile union.' (Vol. iii. p. 74.)

He adds, that although all the different families of the same gens were not, in fact, descended from the same divine or heroic ancestor, they nevertheless *believed* and reported themselves to have this common origin; so deeply was the habit of fabricating genealogies, which were received with unquestioning faith, engrafted in the Greek mind.

At the early time to which we refer, justice was administered at Athens by the nine archons, still selected from the eupatrid, or noble class, according to customary or unwritten rules of law. One of these, Draco, was, in 624, B.C., commissioned to



reduce into writing the principles which were followed in administering the penal law. This task he executed; but Mr. Grote shows that the severity of his code was due, not to his own choice, but to the fidelity with which he digested the existing customs, and that whatever changes he made were on the side of mitigation. The laws of Zaleucus of Locri—the most ancient Greek legislation preserved in writing,—were likewise distinguished by their rigour.

The earliest lawgiver of Athens, who exercised a wide discretion, and gave a permanent form to his own individual policy, was Solon. Solon, a man of middling fortune, but of noble descent, first appeared in public life as stimulating his countrymen to the successful measures they then adopted for the recovery of Salamis from the Megarians; afterwards he took part in supporting the Temple of Delphi against the extortions of the Cirrhæans: But the principal achievement of his life, and that on which his fame mainly rested, was his interference to compose the internal dissensions of his country. Attica was then torn by three factions, partly local and partly social,—the inhabitants of the plain, among whom the rich families were mostly included, the mountaineers, who were chiefly poor, and the inhabitants of the coast, who belonged to an intermediate class. Combined with the disputes of these factions were the misery and suffering of the poorer freemen; who were generally oppressed with heavy debts, and who were subject to a severe law of debtor and creditor, enforced without forbearance. We know from the fuller details of Roman history, to what an extent this law, in a rude state of society, may be made an instrument of oppression in the hands of the rich; and thus engender civil commotions. In the difficulty created by this state of things, the ruling oligarchy turned to Solon, and placed in his hands the dictatorship which was felt to be necessary for the reform of the State. Solon might have made himself a despot, and (as he says in verses still extant) his friends reproached him for his folly in not availing himself of the opportunity; but he turned, with genuine patriotism, to the honest discharge of the duty confided to him. His first measure was the *Seisachtheia*—for the relief of debtors. It cancelled all debts secured upon the land or the person; it cleared the land of the existing mortgage pillars; it released all debtors from actual slavery, and deprived the creditor in future of this power over the insolvent debtor. In order to soften the effect of this operation upon the persons whose legal rights were infringed by it, but whose obligations subsisted in full force, Solon resorted to the further expedient of debasing the money standard: He

lowered the standard of the silver drachma rather more than 25 per cent.; that is to say, 100 drachmas of the new standard were made out of what would have furnished only 73 of the old. Mr. Grote successfully vindicates these extraordinary measures; as being, though infractions of existing rights, rendered necessary, or palpably expedient, by the social state of the country: And he proves this by showing, that after a time they accomplished their purpose, and restored tranquillity and concord; and that violent interferences with property and subsisting contracts never recur in Athenian history; so that the settlement, however inconsistent with general policy, was effectual for its purpose. He also enlarges, in a highly instructive manner, upon the prejudice universal among the ancients, and more strongly entertained by the philosophers than by the people, against lending money at interest. We are unable to extract or abridge this valuable episode, but we commend it to the reader's attention.

Having, by the success of this first and more urgently needed legislation, acquired the public confidence, Solon was further entrusted with the task of reforming the constitution and laws. His first measure in execution of this trust was, in addition to the old Ionic tribes, to divide the free citizens into four classes, according to the amount of their property. Income-taxes were then prescribed according to a graduated scale, varying with each of the three first classes; the members of the higher class being taxed on a larger proportion of their valuation. The true character of this census, which was not understood by former scholars, was first explained by Professor Boeckh in his work on the 'Public Economy of Athens.' Political rights were also apportioned according to the same standard,—the highest honours of the State being reserved for the wealthiest class, and the fourth class being entirely disqualified from office, but at the same time exempted from direct taxation. The citizens of the fourth class, however, received, as members of the ecclesia, or general assembly, the right of concurring in the choice of the archons and other magistrates, and also of calling them to account at the expiration of their year of office. The powers of the ecclesia were likewise increased by the institution of a senate of four hundred members; as a sort of executive body, to prepare matters for the assembly, and give effect to its decrees. At the same time Solon enlarged the functions of the ancient Areopagus, by conferring upon it a censorial inspection over the lives of the citizens, and a general control over the State. These are all the constitutional changes which Mr. Grote considers as properly attributable to Solon; although most writers have enlarged his sphere of action beyond these bounds. He likewise regards it as an error to treat Solon's

reforms as demeratic: He, no doubt, mitigated the existing oligarchy, and laid the foundation of the subsequent democracy; but did not establish an equal democracy, in the sense in which this word was understood in the age of Pericles.

The laws of Solon (which were inscribed partly on wooden rollers or pillars, and partly on certain triangular tablets,) were miscellaneous in their nature, and related to all branches of legislation. We will only advert to one regulation, which stood on the first pillar, prohibiting the exportation of all the raw produce of the Attic soil, except olive oil. According to Plutarch, Solon intended by this prohibition, to encourage the export trade in manufactures, and to promote the industry of artisans. Mr. Grote suggests the following explanation.

‘ This commercial prohibition is founded on principles substantially similar to those which were acted upon in the early history of England, with reference both to corn and wool, and in other European countries also. In so far as it was at all operative, it tended to lessen the total quantity of produce raised upon the soil of Attica, *and thus to keep the price of it from rising*,—a purpose less objectionable (if we assume that the legislator is to interfere at all) than that of our late corn-laws, which were destined to prevent the price of grain from falling. *But the law of Solon must have been altogether inoperative, in reference to the great articles of human subsistence*; for we know that Attica imported, both largely and constantly, grain and salt provisions, probably also wool and flax for the spinning and weaving of the women, and certainly timber for building. Whether the law was ever enforced with reference to figs and honey, may well be doubted; at least these productions of Attica were in after times generally consumed and celebrated throughout Greece. Probably also in the time of Solon, the silver mines of Laureium had hardly begun to be worked: these afterwards became highly productive, and furnished to Athens a commodity for foreign payments not less convenient than lucrative.’ (Vol. iii. p. 180.)

We know that in later times the subsistence of the population of Attica (which never produced sufficient corn for its own consumption), was a subject of unceasing solicitude to the Athenian statesmen. The purpose of Solon’s law could not have been to diminish the *imports* of food: he thought, doubtless, that by restraining its exportation, he should increase the supply for internal consumption, and lower the price: in short, that he should promote cheapness and abundance. He, and others who have recommended this policy, overlooked the fact that, if the native cultivator is shut out of the foreign market, he does not grow for it: and that therefore the prohibition fails in both its objects: Although it is also to be considered that, in circumstances which make exportation profitable, the desire to obtain these profits will stimulate the cultivation of inferior soils, at an

expense which will necessarily raise the price of the produce of soils of all qualities.

After Solon had promulgated his laws, he is said to have gone abroad for ten years,—the term for which the Athenians had sworn to observe them; desirous of avoiding solicitations for their voluntary repeal or alteration. During this time he visited Egypt and Cyprus, and is also said to have held with the Lydian king Cræsus, at Sardis, the conversation which is reported in Herodotus. This incident, and the beautiful tale with which it is connected, are rejected by Mr. Grote, as unhistorical,—the former on chronological grounds, the latter as being manifestly a moral romance.

Solon, though he did not see his own legislation repealed, nevertheless lived long enough to witness the usurpation of Pisistratus, and to encourage an ineffectual resistance to it. His character is thus drawn by Mr. Grote:—

‘How long this distinguished man survived the practical subversion of his own constitution, we cannot certainly determine; but according to the most probable statement he died during the very next year, at the advanced age of eighty. We have only to regret that we are deprived of the means of following more in detail his noble and exemplary character. He represents the best tendencies of his age, combined with much that is personally excellent; the improved ethical sensibility; the thirst for enlarged knowledge and observation, not less potent in old age than in youth; the conception of regularised popular institutions, departing sensibly from the type and spirit of the governments around him, and calculated to found a new character in the Athenian people; a genuine and reflecting sympathy with the mass of the poor, anxious not merely to rescue them from the oppressions of the rich, but also to create in them habits of self-relying industry; lastly, during his temporary possession of a power altogether arbitrary, not merely an absence of all selfish ambition, but a rare discretion in seizing the mean between conflicting exigencies. In reading his poems we must always recollect that what now appears commonplace was once new; so that to his comparatively unlettered age, the social pictures which he draws were still fresh, and his exhortations calculated to live in the memory. The poems composed on moral subjects generally inculcate a spirit of gentleness towards others, and moderation in personal objects: They represent the gods as irresistible, retributive, favouring the good and punishing the bad, though sometimes very tardily. But his compositions on special and present occasions are usually conceived in a more vigorous spirit; denouncing the oppressions of the rich at one time, and the timid submission to Peisistratus at another, and expressing in emphatic language his own proud consciousness of having stood forward as champion of the mass of the people.’ (Vol. iii. p. 208.)

The despotism of Pisistratus and his sons,—established by a

stratagem resembling that of Zopyrus at Babylon and Tarquin at Gabii; interrupted by periods of exile; reestablished by the audacious personation of the Athenian Goddess; at first mild, but at last made cruel by the celebrated attempt of Harmodius and Aristogiton,—is only an episode in Athenian history. During the fifty years which intervened between its rise and fall, the forms of the Solonian constitution continued in existence; and when the Spartans, at the instigation of the Delphian oracle, put it down and expelled Hippias, they resumed their former reality. With the reforms of Clisthenes the Alcmaeonid, who had contributed largely to the deposition of the Pisistratids, begins the second period, of the organised constitution of Athens. Clisthenes, worsted in party disputes with another leader named Isagoras, espoused the popular cause, and introduced a series of constitutional changes, which developed the democratical policy founded by Solon. In the first place, he converted the four old Ionic tribes—consisting of hereditary phratries and gentes, and therefore excluding new citizens of all sorts—into ten tribes, consisting of *demes*, local or cantonal divisions (like our parishes), and therefore comprehending the entire free population. The Solonian distinction of classes remained applicable for the purposes of direct taxation. The senate of four hundred became a senate of five hundred—fifty senators being taken by lot from each tribe successively—and its functions were enlarged. Instead of the supreme military power being vested in the Polemarch Archon exclusively, ten generals, annually elected, one from each tribe, were associated with him. Several other administrative boards of ten, were also created on the same principle. The effective powers of the ecclesia were extended, by increasing the frequency of its meetings; the action of the Areopagus was restrained; and the practice of large popular judicatories, afterwards reduced to a more systematic form, was introduced. To Clisthenes, likewise, is ascribed the introduction of the institution of ostracism—the character and objects of which are ably explained by Mr. Grote. Ostracism was a vote of the general assembly, in the nature of a *privilegium*, according to the Roman phrase, or, as we should say, of a bill of attainder. The votes were given secretly\*,

---

\* We observe that Mr. Grote speaks of the votes being given by means of *oyster shells*. (Vol. iv. p. 201.) But the word *ὄστρακον* always, we believe, means *earthenware*. The name of the person ostracised, or the initial letter of it, was doubtless scratched or marked upon a piece of tile or earthenware, which could easily be procured. Oyster shells were probably not abundant at Athens, nor would they have been convenient to write upon. (See Wolf, *Prolegomena* Hom. § 15. and Ezekiel, iv. 1.) *Discolato*, a species of ostracism, was used at Lucca,

and a number not less than 6000 was required. If this number of voters concurred, the ostracised citizen was sentenced to banishment from the country for ten years — but without loss of property. Mr. Grote shows that this institution, with the securities which surrounded it, was well suited to a society in which constitutional habits were not matured, and in which powerful men were peculiarly likely to overbear the law. It removed dangerous party leaders, without the necessity of resorting to impeachments for imaginary political crimes. If this mild institution had existed in England in the reign of Charles I., the parliament would not perhaps have had recourse to extreme measures for getting rid of Strafford and Laud. Although the issue of the banishment of Henry Bolingbroke in such a case is not assuring: and the savage answer would still apply, — ‘Stone dead hath ‘no fellow.’ The following remarks of Mr. Grote, in reference to the policy of Clisthenes, are peculiarly deserving of attention.

‘It was necessary to create in the multitude, and through them to force upon the leading ambitious men, that rare and difficult sentiment which we may term a *constitutional morality*, a paramount reverence for the forms of the constitution, enforcing obedience to the authorities acting under and within those forms, yet combined with the habit of open speech, of action, subject only to definite legal control, and unrestrained censure of those very authorities as to all their public acts, combined too with a perfect confidence in the bosom of every citizen, amidst the bitterness of party contest, that the forms of the constitution will be not less sacred in the eyes of his opponents than in his own. This coexistence of freedom and self-imposed restraint of obedience to authority, with unmeasured censure of the persons exercising it, may be found in the aristocracy of England (since about 1688), as well as in the democracy of the American United States; and because we are familiar with it, we are apt to suppose it a natural sentiment; though there seems to be few sentiments more difficult to establish and diffuse among a community, judging by the experience of history. We may see how imperfectly it exists at this day in the Swiss cantons; and the many violences of the first French revolution illustrate, among various other lessons, the fatal effects arising from its absence, even among a people high in the scale of intelligence. Yet the diffusion of such constitutional morality, not merely among the majority of any community, but throughout the whole, is the indispensable condition of a government

---

up to the time of the French revolution; and was directed against persons of bad morals, or who transgressed the limits of moderation. Every senator wrote on a ticket the names of the persons whom he considered mischievous, and if twenty-five tickets condemned in three successive discolati, the man was banished. (Botta, Storia d'Italia dal 1789 al 1814, lib. i. vol. i. p. 47.) Bodinus de Rep. iv. 1. is favourable to ostracism.

at once free and peaceable; since even any powerful and obstinate minority may render the working of free institutions impracticable, without being able to conquer ascendancy for themselves. Nothing less than unanimity, or so overwhelming a majority as to be tantamount to unanimity, on the cardinal point of respecting constitutional forms, even by those who do not wholly approve of them, can render the excitement of political passion bloodless, and yet, expose all the authorities in the state to the full license of pacific criticism.' (Vol. iv. p. 205.)

Clisthenes is considered by Mr. Grote, as the principal author of the Athenian democracy, and of the democratic spirit which, according to the testimony of Herodotus, infused so much energy and vigour into the Athenians after the expulsion of their despots.\* Nevertheless, even his constitution was sometimes styled aristocratic, in comparison with the more complete democracy of the age of Pericles. He still preserved considerable judicial powers in the archons, and their election by vote: nor was it till after the battle of Plataea, that the disqualification of the fourth class of citizens for office was removed — a measure which was due to Aristides. At a later date, further democratic changes were made by Pericles and Ephialtes. At this time, the offices of the archons and of other magistrates were, instead of being conferred by a vote of the citizens, made to depend upon lot. The judicial powers of the archons were likewise diminished; and they became the mere formal presidents of the popular courts, which received a more perfect organisation and acquired a more extensive jurisdiction. All jurisdiction, indeed, both civil and criminal, was now exercised by these courts, which were composed thus: — Six thousand of the citizens were annually drawn by lot and sworn, and then distributed into ten panels of five hundred each, the remainder forming a supplement in case of vacancies. When any cause was set down for hearing, the panel by which it would be tried was decided by lot, — so that it could not be known beforehand, which list would try a particular cause. Mr. Grote thinks that, although large popular courts may have previously tried particular questions, their systematic organisation dates from this period; and he considers their daily pay, not exceeding three obols, now introduced by Pericles, a part of the same measure. He has likewise examined at length the true character, both moral and political, of the Athenian judicatories, and removed many misapprehensions which existed on the subject. 'The great number of the judges,

---

\* Sallust makes a similar remark upon the effect of the expulsion of Tarquin. 'Sed civitas, incredibile memoratu est, adeptâ libertate, quantum brevi creverat: tanta cupido gloriæ incesserat.' — *Cat.* c. 7.

their secret suffrage, and the impossibility of knowing beforehand what individuals would sit on any particular cause, afforded securities against corruption and intimidation; while the character of these tribunals was precisely that of *jury-trial*, with all its peculiarities exaggerated. Mr. Grote believes it to be an error, founded on the satire of Aristophanes, to regard the Athenian courts as prone to severity. They gave way to the feeling of the moment, and judged according to their notions of equity in the circumstances of each case,—not according to inflexible rules of law. The administration of justice in Greece was generally, according to modern notions, severe; but it may be confidently asserted, that a popular court of Athens was by no means more inclined to shed blood than the Spartan ephors, or a small tribunal in an oligarchical state. Other new institutions were at the same time added, with a view of throwing impediments in the way of new legislation, and preserving the existing laws from precipitate change. The chief defect of the Athenian system of judicature, in our opinion, was—that it promoted a lax administration of justice, and discouraged the formation of a scientific body of jurisprudence, such as grew up under the Roman system. We trust that when he reaches the Age of the Orators, Mr. Grote will illustrate the causes of this difference.

In the five elaborate chapters (10, 11. 30, 31. 46.) in which Mr. Grote has traced the history of the Athenian constitution down to the time of Pericles,—and of which we have attempted to give an outline,—he confines his view to the body of free citizens, or the commonwealth proper. In order, however, to render the description of Attic society complete, mention ought to be made of the slave-class, who differed from the Spartan helots in being foreigners,—Scythians, Lydians, Phrygians, Thracians, Thessalians, &c. — and were therefore less formidable and less capable of combination. The existence of slavery, however, and on a lamentably large scale, meets us at the very dawn of Athenian history, in the account of the Solonian legislation; and the new comedy, as reflected in the plays of Plautus and Terence, shows how important a feature the foreign slave—the Davus or Geta—was in an Athenian household. A comparison of the Greek slavery with the European villenage of the middle ages and the negro slavery of America and its islands, is a fitting theme for Mr. Grote's pen\*: particu-

---

\* The subject is treated with great ability by M. Wallon, in his *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*; in an introduction on Slavery in the Colonies.



larly in reference to its argumentative justification by Aristotle. In considering the political institutions of the Greeks, it must always be borne in mind, that the great majority of the community, or population at least, were slaves. Slavery was a constant substratum under Greek society; which, though but seldom referred to, was always recognised, and felt to be at the bottom. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake and a source of perpetual confusion, to adopt the view of those writers who wish that the democratic governments of antiquity should, on this account, be treated as aristocracies. Each community of freemen was complete within itself, and might be organised either on oligarchical or on democratical principles. At the same time, the fact that the labouring class consisted chiefly of slaves, exercised a perpetual influence upon the body of free citizens and their internal relations: And in particular, the important questions, which are now comprehended under the name of *socialism*, were, in the most democratic of the Grecian states, practically solved, by making all manual labourers slaves. This circumstance should not be lost sight of, when we speak of the *rich* and *poor* citizens:—the poorest citizen was still a householder, and probably the owner of one or two slaves: And consequently, the lowest class of citizens, who formed the democratic party in a Greek republic, were altogether unlike the populace of our large cities, or even the operatives of our manufacturing towns: a fact which modern critics of the ancient democracies do not sufficiently appreciate. The existence of an indigenous population, whom the new settlers had reduced to slavery or dependence, is likewise an important fact in the history of Greek colonization.

Before Mr. Grote commences his continuous recital of the events of Greek history, as related by the great contemporary historians—Herodotus and Thucydides, he takes a survey of the outlying Greek colonies, and also of the foreign nations with whom the Greeks came in contact. Beginning with the Greek settlements on the Black Sea, he passes along Asia Minor and the islands of the *Ægean*, Cyrene, Sicily and Magna Græcia, the islands and coast of the Adriatic, Epirus, Macedonia, and the other mountain districts of Northern Greece. He also describes the characteristics of the principal nations by which the Greeks were surrounded, viz.—the Thracians, Scythians, Phrygians, Lydians, Medes, Assyrians, Persians, Phœnicians, Egyptians, and Carthaginians. This extensive survey, for which all the stores of ancient erudition have been unlocked, brings before our eyes a striking picture—imperfect indeed in its details, but clear and distinct in its outlines—of the state of the nations adjoining

the Mediterranean, at the commencement of authentic history. Though the subject is necessarily deficient in unity, the combined effect of this panoramic view is in the highest degree impressive. That part of it which relates to the Asiatic and African nations is not strictly within the limits of Greek history; but Mr. Grote has, we think, made a just estimate of the nature of his problem in including it in his work. A survey of Oriental history, and of the state of the Oriental nations, is important, for two reasons, with reference to Greece. 1. As showing what the Greeks originated,—how much was peculiar to them,—and how far they altered and improved upon the Oriental type, then the highest standard of civilisation. 2. As determining the course of the chief events in Greek history.

There were certain characteristics by which the Greeks as a body, however politically divided, were from the earliest times distinguished from the *barbarians*, or foreigners. ‘In no city of historical Greece,’ says Mr. Grote, ‘did there prevail either human sacrifices, or deliberate mutilation, such as cutting off the nose, ears, hands, feet, &c., or castration, or selling of children into slavery, or polygamy, or the feeling of unlimited obedience towards one man:—all of them customs which might be pointed out as existing among the contemporary Carthaginians, Egyptians, Persians, Thracians, &c.’ (Vol. ii. p. 337.) In general terms it may be said, that every thing important in government, literature, the fine arts, historical composition, and science, *originated* substantially with the Greeks. In the fine arts, indeed, music is a partial exception, for which they borrowed something from the Lydians and Phrygians; and in practical astronomy, they were assisted by the observations of the early Chaldeans\*: but it was in the useful arts that their obligations to the East were largest,—especially in the all-important matter of alphabetical writing, as well as in the system of money and of weights and measures.† As to the influence exer-

---

\* Aristotle assigns the origin of mathematics to Egypt (Met. i. 1.); but it seems to have been geometry in the practical, not the scientific sense, which the Egyptians invented.

† There is one peculiarity of European customs for which we are indebted to the Greeks, and which may deserve mention in a note: we allude to the treatment of the dog as the *companion of man*. Among the Orientals he was and still is an unclean animal: the only mention of the dog in the Old Testament as the companion of man is in the apocryphal book of Tobit, v. 16. xi. 4. See also Matt. xv. 27.; but at this period the manners of the Jews were partly Hellenized. In Homer we find the dog used not only for hunting, for guarding flocks

cised by the great Asiatic nations upon Greek history, we will trace it so far as our space will permit.

The historical relations of Asia and Greece begin to be important in the reign of Croesus, king of the Lydians, whose dominions reached as far as the Halys. To the east of that boundary lay the Median kingdom of Astyages\*; while Laby-netus, king of the Assyrians, had at Babylon the seat of his empire, which extended over the subject territories of Judæa and Phœnicia to the frontiers of Egypt. At this time, as Mr. Grote remarks†, the Ionians of Asia Minor, and the colonies of Southern Italy, were the leading States of the Grecian name. Sparta and Athens, and the other States in the comparatively barren territory of Central Greece, had, at that time, a far less effective command of men and money than those flourishing communities. The early Ionian settlers on the coast of Asia Minor had found no large nation to check their growth or crush their independence; and they accordingly soon exhibited the activity and mobility which characterised Greek colonization; and rose, in their separate cities, to a high state of opulence and prosperity. But when Croesus, about the middle of the 6th century, B. C., attacked them with all the resources of the Lydian monarchy, they were unable to combine for self-defence;—the weakness of their political system became apparent, and they were reduced to subjection. The face of affairs was, however, speedily changed, by one of those great national convulsions which abound in Oriental, and indeed in all semi-barbarous, history. Cyrus had then just founded the Persian kingdom upon the ruins of the Median; and Croesus, having provoked the conqueror, was himself attacked in his capital at Sardis, defeated, and dethroned. Before this event, which occurred in 546 B. C., Cyrus had applied for assistance to the Ionic Greeks, which they had

---

and herds and houses, but also as an inmate of the house and the companion of man. See *Iliad*, xxii. 69., xxiii. 173.; *Od.* xvii. 309. Telemachus is described in several passages of the *Odyssey* as accompanied in public by dogs. The Maltese lapdog is mentioned by Aristotle as familiarly known in his time; *Hist. An.* x. 6. Problem. x. 12. *Catellus* and *catella* were used as terms of endearment by the Romans, which indicates a totally different feeling towards the dog from the Oriental repugnance.

\* The account of the Median and Lydian armies being separated by a total eclipse, which Mr. Grote, with the great majority of writers, treats as historical (vol. iii. p. 310.), is rejected as altogether fabulous by M. Daunou, '*Cours d'Études historiques*,' tom. viii. p. 127—9. Compare Bailly, *Phil. Trans.* vol. ci. p. 220.

† Vol. iii. p. 327.

refused. They now in their turn applied to Cyrus, to be received as voluntary subjects of his new Persian empire; but the offer came too late, and Harpagus was employed to reduce them by force,—a task which having accomplished, he afterwards used the Greeks for subjugating the other nations of Asia Minor.\* The result of this revolution was, that the Asiatic Greeks were governed by Persian satraps, and that their tributes were remitted to Ecbatana or Susa, instead of to Sardis. Cyrus, in the meantime, had turned his arms against the nations of Upper Asia, many of which he subdued, and, after taking Babylon, is said to have lost his life in a war against the Massagetzæ. Nineveh, the primitive capital of the Assyrian empire, had been taken by Cyaxares the Mede, about 600 B.C., and appears to have been ruined by the conquerors; so that it was at this time uninhabited. Babylon, however, with its gigantic constructions, remained standing; and was visited by Herodotus, who, as an eye-witness, reports that it was surrounded by walls 300 feet in height, and 75 feet in thickness; composing a square of which each side was 120 stadia (or nearly 15 English miles) in length. Upon the state of things which led to the vast works of the Oriental kingdoms, Mr. Grote has these observations:—

‘That which strikes us most, and which must have struck the first Grecian visitors much more, both in Assyria and Egypt, is the unbounded command of naked human strength possessed by these early kings; and the effect of mere mass and indefatigable perseverance, unaided either by theory or by artifice, in the accomplishment of gigantic results. In Assyria the results were in great part exaggerations of enterprises in themselves useful to the people—for irrigation and defence: religious worship was ministered to in the like manner, as well as the personal fancies and pomp of their kings: while in Egypt the latter class predominates more over the former. We scarcely trace in either of them the higher sentiment of art—which owes its first marked development to Grecian susceptibility and genius. But the human mind is, in every stage of its progress, and most of all in its rude and unreflecting period, strongly impressed by visible and tangible magnitude, and awe-struck by the evidences of great power. To this feeling, for what exceeded the demands of practical convenience and security, the wonders both in Egypt and Assyria chiefly appealed; while the execution of such colossal works demonstrates habits of regular industry, a concentrated population under one government, and, above all, an implicit submission to the regal and priestly sway,—contrasting forcibly with the small autonomous communities of Greece and Western Europe, wherein the will of

\* The taking of Xanthus by Harpagus is supposed to be represented on the frieze brought from Asia Minor by Mr. Fellows, and now in the British Museum. See a paper by Sir Edmund Head, in the *Classical Museum*, vol. i. p. 222.

the individual citizen was so much more energetic and uncontrolled. The acquisition of habits of regular industry, so foreign to the natural temper of man, was brought about in Egypt and Assyria, in China and Hindostan, before it had acquired any footing in Europe; but it was purchased either by prostrate obedience to a despotic rule, or by imprisonment within the chain of a consecrated institution of caste. Even during the Homeric period of Greece, these countries had attained a certain civilisation in mass, without the acquisition of any high mental qualities or the development of any individual genius: the religious and political sanction, sometimes combined and sometimes separate, determined for every one his mode of life, his creed, his duties, and his place in society, without leaving any scope for the will or reason of the agent himself.' (Vol. iii. p. 401.)

It is difficult to judge how far the account of a wall, 300 feet in height and 60 miles in length, is to be believed. Such a construction certainly leaves far behind it the greatest works of our railways. Herodotus, however, is no doubt, a veracious witness as to what he himself saw, and Mr. Grote credits his statement; but the ancients were lax in questions of measurement. Nor does there appear any adequate motive for building a wall of so vast a height.\* There are, indeed, numerous authentic examples of enormous works, dictated by the command, and sometimes by the caprice, of eastern despots. In Assyria, besides the vast constructions of Nineveh and Babylon, stupendous works of embankment and irrigation were connected with the Euphrates; and the wall of Media, 100 feet high and 20 thick, reached 75 miles from the Tigris to one of the canals of the Euphrates. Cyrus, in order to avenge the drowning of one of the sacred white horses in the river Gyndes, employed his army for a whole summer in digging 360 artificial channels for the purpose of dispersing and destroying the stream. He is likewise said to have dug a vast reservoir and canal, which enabled him to drain off the waters of the Euphrates so as to afford an entry to his army into Babylon. Darius threw a bridge of boats over the Thracian Bosphorus for his Scythian expedition, and another over

---

\* As the walls of Babylon were not (like the great pyramid, which is 479 feet in vertical height) made for mere ostentation, but were intended as a defence to the town, it is impossible to understand what could have been the inducement to build a brick (or even earthen) wall 300 feet high, only 60 feet less than the height of St. Paul's. Even 100 feet, the height assigned by Xenophon for the wall of Media, which he himself saw, seems scarcely credible. (Anab. ii. 4. 12.) Xenophon describes the wall of Mespila, which he also saw, as consisting of a stone base 50 feet both in width and height, upon which was a brick wall 50 feet in width and 100 in height, with a circumference of  $22\frac{1}{2}$  miles. This wall, therefore, would have been 150 feet high. (Anab. iii.

the Danube, not far from the mouth. The first bridge of boats thrown by Xerxes over the Hellespont, a mile in length, having been broken by the weather, was replaced by a double bridge, over which his vast army marched to Greece: the canal dug across the promontory of Athos was a mile and a half in length, and was broad and deep enough for two triremes to sail abreast.\* At a later date Artaxerxes Mnemon, in anticipation of the invasion of Cyrus the Younger, caused a ditch to be dug 30 feet wide and 8 feet deep, from the wall of Media to the river Euphrates, a distance of 45 miles. The monument of Alyattes, the Lydian king, near Sardis, was an enormous pyramidal mound upon a stone base, erected by the combined labour of the city. It is unnecessary to do more than allude to the pyramids, the labyrinth, and other gigantic works of Egypt; many of which still remain to attest the immense muscular labour, which in a rude and unmechanical age must have been expended upon them. Necos began a canal from the Nile to the Red Sea, but abandoned the attempt after 120,000 Egyptians were said to have perished in the work.† The great wall of China, from 20 to 25 feet high, and wide enough for six horses to run abreast, reaches 1200 miles along the north of China. The modern history of India likewise affords an example of an enormous building erected by a sovereign for a purpose of mere regal ostentation. The Taj Mahul, the mausoleum of Shah Jehan's queen, who died in 1631, occupied 20,000 men for twenty-two years, and cost 3,174,802*l*.‡ Even in the New World we meet with similar works. The pyramids of Mexico, and other great constructions discovered of late years in America, appear to belong to the same class.

---

4. 10.) A wall of the magnitude described by Herodotus could not, at the present contract prices in England, be executed at a less cost than 5625*l*. per yard; which would give a sum of 584,000,000*l*. for the entire sixty miles. Strabo, xvi. 1., says that the wall of Babylon was 32 feet thick, and 50 cubits high, with towers 60 cubits high—equal to 75 feet for the wall and 90 feet for the towers. Mr. Rich, in his 'Memoir on Babylon,' states that he was unable to discover the least trace of the ancient walls, nor can he account for their entire disappearance. (P. 83. ed. 1839.) Upon the alleged height of the walls of Ecbatana, see the apocryphal book of Judith, i. 1—4.

\* The traces of this canal are still distinctly visible. Besides the description in Col. Leake's work, see the account given from actual survey in the Penny Cyclopædia,—article Athos.

† Mr. Grote believes (on what seem to us adequate grounds) that Africa was circumnavigated by a Phœnician ship from east to west, under the direction of Necos, about 600 B.C. (Vol. iii. p. 377—385.)

‡ Sleeman's *Rambles of an Indian Official*, vol. ii. p. 32.

The Persian empire descended from Cyrus its founder, to his impetuous son Cambyzes; and, after the short usurpation of Smerdis, was seized by Darius, a prince celebrated for his power and wealth, who organised the internal administration of his wide-spread dominions. But like the other great Oriental kingdoms, the Persian empire was nothing but an aggregate of dependent provinces, yielding allegiance and paying tribute to a small central district, in which the monarch resided, and whose inhabitants were favoured beyond any other part of his dominions. The self-confidence of the king and governing portion of the empire, had been stimulated by a long series of conquests; so that when Aristagoras induced the Ionians to revolt, and, with the assistance of the Athenians and Eretrians, captured and burnt the city of Sardis, the anger of Darius was roused. Having suppressed the Ionic revolt, he determined to attack the mainland of Greece, and be avenged upon the Athenians. The Ionian colonies had clearly shown that they had not sufficient power of joint action, or endurance of toil, to make a successful resistance, either by sea or land, to their Persian masters; nor was any one State able to obtain a preeminence over the rest, and use their resources for the common defence, against their will. At this important point, therefore, where the colossal weight of Persia seems about to crush the comparatively diminutive body of Greece, the task of resisting the Persian invader, and stopping the inundation of Oriental barbarism, is thrown upon the Greeks of the mainland. It is not our wish to scrutinise closely the precise share of merit due to the leading States of Central Greece in the conduct of that glorious struggle, crowned by decisive triumph over the invader; the narrative of which cannot be read, for the hundredth time, without deep emotion. Marathon, and, for the most part, Salamis and Mycale, are the work of Athens, — Thermopylæ, and, to a large extent, Platæa, of Sparta. By the courage, intelligence, and moral superiority in contending against overwhelming numbers, which the Greeks exhibited at this great crisis, they have earned the imperishable gratitude of all civilised nations. Xerxes, having undertaken to avenge the reverse sustained by his father, and returned a fugitive to the Hellespont, never attempted to rally the scattered remnants of his vast host: And after a time the Persian monarchs found it prudent to acquiesce in a compromise: which lasted until Alexander retaliated upon them with effect, and inflicted upon Persia a wound which Persia had been unable to inflict upon Greece.

But even after Xerxes had fled from Salamis, after Mardonius and nearly all his army had been cut down at Platæa, and the Persian fleet had been destroyed at Mycale, much remained to be done for extirpating the Persian power from the islands and

shores of the *Ægean*. And this great task devolved upon *Athens*. Having the largest fleet and the most practised crews,—the Athenian discipline and skill being by sea what the Spartan discipline and skill were by land,—she was voluntarily placed, by the insular and Asiatic Greeks, at the head of the anti-Persian confederacy. This place was ceded to her by *Sparta*, hitherto the leader of continental Greece; who now retired within her accustomed sphere, and left the maritime war to be completed by a maritime power. Originally, therefore, this combination was wholly voluntary. It was formed for a purpose in which all its members had, no doubt, a common interest: But it was felt that that interest was best promoted by giving the lead to the energetic, enterprising, well-trained, and hardy Athenians. The contribution of each member was fixed: some States furnished ships and men; others commuted their quota for a money-payment, which was equitably assessed by the just Aristides. The proceeds of this assessment were paid into a federal treasury at *Delos*, and delivered to officers named *Hellenotamiæ*. The meetings of the confederacy were also appointed to be held in the same central spot. The first assessment was 460 talents (about 120,000*l.*)—which certainly seems a moderate sum for such a purpose. By degrees, however, this league of members with equal rights, contributing to a common fund, in which Athens enjoyed a voluntarily admitted headship,—was converted into a dominion exercised by Athens, as the imperial and paramount State, over subject communities paying her a tribute exacted by force. The change was gradual and irregular; some cities were reduced before others, and the important islands of *Lesbos* and *Chios* remained free from tribute until the *Peloponnesian* war. The ultimate result, however, was,—that the maritime Greek subjects of Persia became the subjects of Athens; that the *Ægean* became an Athenian lake; that the federal treasury, transferred from *Delos* to Athens, became an imperial fund, and the affairs of the subject allies were determined by the deliberations, not of a federal council, but of the assembly of citizens at Athens.

The state of things thus introduced was, in antiquity, the universal result of conquest or predominant power. Whenever an ancient tribe or government extended its dominions, the annexed territories became dependencies. This was equally the case whatever might be the form of government in the paramount State—whether monarchical, oligarchical, or democratical; in Persia and Carthage, in *Sparta*, Athens, and Rome. The imperial rule of Athens was, as Mr. Grote has shown, exercised on the whole with moderation. There were no very onerous obligations imposed on the subject State; and so long as it was quiet, and submitted patiently to its condition of dependence, it had little



to complain of. But the loss of independence was a bitter privation to the Greek freeman; and hence the dominion of Athens rested ultimately on force or fear. Her own orators and statesmen accordingly always represent her as standing in the same relation to her dependent cities as a despot to his individual subjects; and openly proclaim the necessity of using towards them the terrible maxims of Greek despotism. Hence, revolt was summarily punished, as in the memorable case of Mytilene; while, on the other hand, the proceedings of Brasidas, in Thrace, show that much persuasion and cajolery, backed by the presence of a Lacedæmonian army\*, might be necessary, in order to induce an Athenian dependent city to throw off its allegiance.

The history of these subject allies of Athens, — of the transition from a voluntary *hegemony* or headship, to a compulsive imperial rule, — has never been so well written, or half so well explained, as by Mr. Grote. We believe that the Athenian dependencies were as mildly governed as any others in antiquity, though not so skilfully and efficiently as those of Rome. At the same time, we do not know that we can quite assent to the proposition of Mr. Grote, that they were as well governed as the dependencies of England in the last century (vol. vi. p. 64.). The question cannot indeed be satisfactorily decided, on account of our imperfect knowledge of the extent and mode of interference of Athens with the internal affairs of her subjects: but England has this important advantage in the comparison, — that in antiquity, the dependencies were always regarded as a mine to be worked for the benefit of the paramount State; whereas, England, whatever commercial restraints she imposed on her dependencies, never drew a tribute or revenue from them. The rapacity of Hastings, in India, to which Mr. Grote refers, cannot be fairly considered as a part of the recognised system of England: while, of late years, we have contrived, in many cases, by means of differential duties, to make the paramount State tributary to the dependency, — and have thus substantially reversed the ancient system.

We had wished to lay before the reader an outline of Mr. Grote's account of Greek colonization — a subject which he has discussed with remarkable success — but we are compelled to close our notice of this work, which, even in its present incomplete state, is indispensable to every student of the transactions it relates: which is equally important as well for the light it

---

\* We doubt whether the reluctance of the Acanthians to revolt, adverted to by Mr. Grote, (vol. vi. p. 551.) proves any friendly feeling on their part towards Athens. We suspect that they only distrusted the power of Sparta to protect them from the probable vengeance of the Athenians.

throws upon the proper treatment of the mythological period, and for the due estimation of the political institutions, as for the narrative of the historical events; and which, after all the admirable special works on Greek antiquities, must be considered as forming an epoch in Grecian histories.

Acting on the principle, '*Boni judicis est ampliare jurisdictionem*,' Mr. Grote accompanies his political history with a survey of the contemporary movements in literature and science. In the volumes before us he accordingly describes the elegiac and lyric poets who intervened between the early epic poetry and Pindar; and he also devotes a chapter to the Ionic and Eleatic philosophers, and the obscure topic of Pythagoras. We trust that he will continue these surveys throughout the whole period of his history; and in particular that, when their time comes, he will give us not only an analysis, but an estimate of the political philosophy of Plato and Aristotle.

The recent histories of Bishop Thirlwall and Mr. Grote, together with the chronological work of Mr. Clinton, have gone far towards repaying the debt which we owe to Germany for so much light shed upon antiquity. We have seen likewise, with much satisfaction, the announcement of a new history of Grecian literature, by so judicious and accomplished a scholar as Colonel Mure. There is, however, one department of Greek antiquity which is still imperfectly explored, and which we would gladly see illustrated by an English hand. Greek literature and Greek philosophy have each found their historians; but the efforts of the Greeks in the physical and mathematical sciences, and their knowledge generally of outward nature, have never received a systematic treatment. Ample materials, indeed, exist in scattered works, and in commentaries upon single writers; but a connected view is still a desideratum. It is still from Lord Bacon's writings that the modern view of the Greek Physics is generally taken. Bacon had a great task to accomplish—to overthrow the defective method of investigating Nature, established by the prevailing scholastic philosophy, and to substitute an improved method. All existing sciences were, as he truly said, derived from the Greeks\*; and he attributed to the same origin the barren and unprofitable mode of philosophising which had grown up under the empire of the scholastic system. Hence his attention was almost exclusively turned to the worst parts of Greek science—such as the Physics of Aristotle, which was the manual still used in the schools; and he did not attach

---

\* '*Scientiæ, quas habemus, ferè a Græcis fluxerunt. Quæ enim scriptores Romani, aut Arabes, aut recentiores addiderunt, non multa, aut magni momenti sunt: et qualiacunque sint, fundata sunt super basin eorum quæ inventa sunt a Græcis.*' Nov. Org. i. 71.

sufficient weight to those branches of science, as geometry, mechanics, astronomy, medicine, and natural history, in which their positive researches had borne abundant fruit. His acquaintance, moreover, with the Greek language and literature was, like that of his most learned countrymen in the time of Elizabeth and James I., very limited. The same unfavourable view of the Greek Physics is however taken by the most approved modern writers on the history of the natural sciences. They represent the physical philosophy of the Greeks as an entire failure. It appears to us that this estimate of the Greek Physics is not founded on a just appreciation of the case. In the first place, it does not sufficiently recognise the important fact that the Greeks first conceived the idea of physical science, and laid the foundation of a system of positive researches into the different departments of outward nature. The observations of the Chaldeans at Babylon, though of very early date, had never, in their own country, been made the foundation of any astronomical science. In the next place, it takes no note of those branches of science in which the Greeks accumulated a store of observed facts, and reduced them to a scientific form. We are fully sensible of the immense progress which the physical sciences have made since the time of Bacon; and we are very far from undervaluing that philosophy which has so greatly enlarged our intellectual horizon in the realm of Nature. The moderns may, however, at the lofty elevation on which they stand, well afford to do full justice to the imperfect, though invaluable, efforts of their predecessors in the same field of inquiry.\*

---

\* We subjoin, in a note, remarks on a few passages of ancient authors adverted to by Mr. Grote:—

Vol. iii. p. 234. We suspect that the story as to the murder of the Carian men, cited from Herod. i. 146. is merely a legend explanatory of the real subsisting custom, for the Ionian wives not to eat with their husbands. Compare Mr. Grote's own remarks on a similar case, vol. iv. p. 268., where the legend is repeated by Justin, i. 7.

Page 312. The Cimmerians of the Odyssey appear to us to be purely mythical. They belong, in our judgment, to the same class as the Phæacians, Læstrygones, Lotophagi, and other imaginary races in that poem. See vol. i. p. 336.

Page 432. In the passage of Strabo, the words *κατὰ Κυαζάρην, οὗτος δὲ τῶν Μήδων*, are, we think, an interpolation, suggested by the fact that Psammetichus and Cyaxares were cotemporaries. See Herod. i. 105, 106. Mr. Grote's explanation with regard to the name of Inarus in this passage is satisfactory.

Vol. iv. p. 170. We agree with Dr. Thirlwall in thinking that the passage of Aristotle cannot be construed as it stands. If Aristotle

ART. V. — *Shirley: a Tale.* By CURREN BELL, Author of 'Jane Eyre.' Smith, Elder, and Co. 1849.

THE gallant suggestion of our great Peasant Poet, that Nature 'tried her 'prentice hand' on Man, before venturing on the finer task of fashioning Woman, has not yet found acceptance otherwise than as a sportive caprice of fancy — the

---

had meant to say that slaves were made citizens, he would have used the word *ἡλευθέρωσε*, not *ἐφυλέτευσε*, which latter word is applicable only to freemen not yet admitted into a tribe. Slaves must be emancipated before they can receive political franchises. It appears to us that the word *δούλους* ought to be expunged.

Vol. v. p. 63. If Mr. Grote is right in reading *κεῖναι* in the passage of Herodotus, we would rather understand 'unarmed hands,' 'hands 'with nothing in their grasp.' In i. 73. the same expression is applied to persons returning *empty-handed* from the chase.

Page 150. We agree with Dr. Arnold about the meaning of *αἱ δύο* in Thucydides.

Vol. vi. p. 57. We think that in the passage of Thucydides *δικαὶ ἀπὸ συμβόλων* are meant, and in p. 132. we cannot accede to the proposed interpretation of Aristophanes. We agree, however, in rejecting the hypothesis that the words of Thucydides refer to the same incident as that mentioned in the jocular account of the comic poet.

Page 147. (cf. p. 104.) The remark of Pericles on the Megarian decree is unjust. The Spartan xenelasia was inhospitable, but inflicted no positive harm upon foreigners. Their necessities could not take them to Sparta. But the Megarians, by being prevented from trading with all places under Athenian rule, were virtually subjected to a blockade,—they were half-starved : see p. 184.

Page 338. Dionysius de Thucyd. Jud. c. 17. cannot understand why Thucydides should report at length the speeches in the second debate on the Mytilenæan question, and not those in the first. Mr. Grote suggests that he may have been partly influenced in this preference by his dislike for Cleon. It appears to us that the superior importance of the second debate — which really decided the question — affords a natural and satisfactory explanation of the historian's choice.

Page 377. We cannot assent to Mr. Grote's construction of the obscure clause *τὸ δ' ἐμπλήκτως ὄξυν, &c.* We are disposed, to follow three MSS. which read *ἀσφάλεια δὲ τοῦ ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι* τὸ and τοῦ were identical in the writing of Thucydides, and the passage may have been misunderstood by those who first modernised the orthography. Thus in Soph. CEd. T. 1279, *αἱματοῦς* is the right reading, where the MSS. read *αἷματος*. These words form, we think, the subject of the proposition, and mean 'safety in concerting 'measures against an enemy.' How to construe the predicate is less obvious: we admit that *ἀποτροπή* elsewhere always has an active sense :

sort of playful resignation of superiority which threw Samson at the feet of Dalilah, and made Hercules put aside his strength, —

‘Spinning with Omphale, — and all for Love!’

Men in general, when serious and *not* gallant, are slow to admit woman even to an equality with themselves; and the prevalent opinion certainly is that women are inferior in respect of intellect. This opinion may be correct. The question is a delicate one. We very much doubt, however, whether sufficient *data* exist for any safe or confident decision. For the position of women in society has never yet been — perhaps never can be — such as to give fair play to their capabilities. It is true, no doubt, that none of them have yet attained to the highest eminence in the highest departments of intellect. They have had no Shakespeare, no Bacon, no Newton, no Milton, no Raphael, no Mozart, no Watt, no Burke. But while this is admitted, it is surely not to be forgotten that these are the *few* who have carried off the high prizes to which millions of *Men* were equally qualified by their training and education to aspire, and for which, by their actual pursuits, they may be held to have been contending; while the number of *Women* who have had either the benefit of such training, or the incitement of such pursuits, has been comparatively insignificant. When the bearded competitors were numbered by thousands, and the smooth-chinned by scores, what was the chance of the latter? Or with what reason could their failure be ascribed to their inferiority as a class?

Nevertheless, with this consideration distinctly borne in mind, we must confess our doubts whether women will ever rival men in *some* departments of intellectual exertion; and especially in those which demand either a long preparation, or a protracted effort of pure thought. But we do not, by this, prejudge the question of superiority. We assume no general organic inferiority; we simply assert an organic *difference*. Women, we are entirely disposed to admit, are substantially *equal* in the aggregate worth of their endowments: But equality does not imply identity. They may be equal, but not exactly alike. Many of their endowments are specifically different. Mentally as well as bodily there seem to be organic diversities; and these must

---

but this circumstance is not of much weight, as the substantives of this form oscillate between the active and passive meanings. Thus *τροπή*, *ἐκτροπή*, and *παρτροπή* are both active and passive; *ἀνατροπή*, *ἐκτροπή*, and *προτροπή* are active; while *ἐντροπή*, *περιτροπή*, and *προστροπή*, with its adjective *προστροπῆαιος*, are passive. On the whole, we incline to believe that Thucydides here uses the word to signify *detrectatio*.

make themselves felt, whenever the two sexes come into competition.

The grand function of woman, it must always be recollected, is, and ever must be, *Maternity*: and this we regard not only as her distinctive characteristic, and most endearing charm, but as a high and holy office—the prolific source, not only of the best affections and virtues of which our nature is capable, but also of the wisest thoughtfulness, and most useful habits of observation, by which that nature can be elevated and adorned. But with all this, we think it impossible to deny, that it must essentially interfere both with that steady and unbroken application, without which no proud eminence in science can be gained—and with the discharge of all official or professional functions that do not admit of long or frequent postponement. All women are intended by Nature to be mothers; and by far the greater number—not less, we suppose, than nine tenths—are called upon to act in that sacred character; and, consequently, for twenty of the best years of their lives—those very years in which men either rear the grand fabric or lay the solid foundations of their fame and fortune—women are mainly occupied by the cares, the duties, the enjoyments and the sufferings of maternity. During large parts of these years, too, their bodily health is generally so broken and precarious as to incapacitate them for any strenuous exertion; and, health apart, the greater portion of their time, thoughts, interests, and anxieties ought to be, and generally are, centered in the care and the training of their children. But how could such occupations consort with the intense and unremitting studies which seared the eyeballs of Milton, and for a time unsettled even the powerful brain of Newton? High art and science always require the whole man; and never yield their great prizes but to the devotion of a life. But the life of a woman, from her cradle upwards, is otherwise devoted: and those whose lot it is to expend their best energies, from the age of twenty to the age of forty, in the cares and duties of maternity, have but slender chances of carrying off these great prizes. It is the same with the high functions of statesmanship, legislation, generalship, judgeship, and other elevated stations and pursuits, to which some women, we believe, have recently asserted the equal pretensions of their sex. Their still higher and *indispensable* functions of maternity afford the answer to all such claims. What should we do with a leader of opposition in the seventh month of her pregnancy? or a general in chief who at the opening of a campaign was ‘doing as well as could be expected’? or a chief justice with twins?\*

---

\* Plato, indeed, argues that women should be trained to exercises

If it be said that these considerations only apply to wives and mothers, and ought not to carry along with them any disqualification of virgins or childless widows, the answer is, that as Nature qualifies and apparently designs *all* women to be mothers, it is impossible to know who are to escape that destiny, till it is too late to begin the training necessary for artists, scholars, or politicians. On the other hand, too much stress has, we think, been laid on man's superiority in physical strength—as if that, in itself, were sufficient to account for the differences in intellectual power. It should be remembered that, in the great contentions of man with man, it has not been physical strength which has generally carried the day; and it should further be remembered, that it is precisely in *that* art which demands least employment of physical force, viz.—music, that the apparent inferiority of women is most marked and unaccountable. Indeed music is by far the most embarrassing topic to which those who maintain the mental equality of the sexes can address themselves. It is true, that of all kinds of genius, a genius for music is the least akin to and the least associated with any other. But, on the other hand, it is an art that is cultivated by all women who have the least aptitude for it; and in which, as far as mere taste and execution are concerned, many more women than men are actually found to excel. But, as *Composers*, they have never attained any distinction. They have often been great, indeed, as performers—whether with the impassioned grandeur of a Pasta and a Viardot, or with the perfect vocalisation of a Lind and an Alboni—whether pianists, such as Camille Pleyel—violinists, such as Madame Flipowicz or the little Milanolo—whether as organists, or even as trombone (!) players—yet in musical Composition they are absolutely without rank. We can understand their not creating the stormy grandeur and tumultuary harmonies, the gloom and the enchanting loveliness of a Beethoven, since to *that* height women never have attained in any art; but why no one among them should yet have rivalled the moonlight tenderness and plaintive delicacy of a Bellini, is a mystery to us.

It is in literature, however, that women have most distinguished themselves; and probably because hundreds have cultivated literature, for one that has cultivated science or art. Their list of names in this department is a list that would rank high even among literary males. Madame de Stael was certainly as powerful

---

of war, since the female dogs guard sheep as well as the male! But this is one of the many 'exquisite reasons' of the Divine Philosopher, which look very like puerility. Duncan's strange account of the King of Dahomey's Amazonian corps, several thousands strong, is the only real experiment of the sort we ever heard of.

a writer as any man of her age or country; and whatever may be the errors of George Sand's opinions, she is almost without a rival in eloquence, power, and invention. Mrs. Hemans, Miss Edgeworth, Miss Baillie, Miss Austen, Mrs. Norton, Miss Mitford, Miss Landon, are second only to the first-rate men of their day; and would probably have ranked even higher, had they not been too solicitous about male excellence,—had they not often written from the man's point of view, instead of from the woman's. That which irretrievably condemns the whole literature of Rome to the second rank,—viz. imitation,—has also kept down the literature of women. The Roman only thought of rivalling a Greek,—not of mirroring life in his own nationality; and so women have too often thought but of rivalling men. It is their boast to be mistaken for men,—instead of speaking sincerely and energetically as women. So true is this, that in the department where they have least followed men, and spoken more as women,—we mean in Fiction,—their success has been greatest. Not to mention other names, surely no man has surpassed Miss Austen as a delineator of common life? Her range, to be sure, is limited; but her art is perfect. She does not touch those profounder and more impassioned chords which vibrate to the heart's core—never ascends to its grand or heroic movements, nor descends to its deeper throes and agonies; but in all she attempts she is uniformly and completely successful.

It is curious too, and worthy of a passing remark, that women have achieved success in every department of fiction but that of *humour*. They deal, no doubt, in sly humorous touches often enough; but the broad provinces of that great domain are almost uninvaded by them; beyond the outskirts, and open borders, they have never ventured to pass. Compare Miss Austen, Miss Ferriar, and Miss Edgeworth, with the lusty mirth and riotous humour of Shakspeare, Rabelais, Butler, Swift, Fielding, Smollett, or Dickens and Thackeray. It is like comparing a quiet smile with the 'inextinguishable laughter' of the Homeric gods! So also on the stage,—there have been comic actresses of incomparable merit, lively, pleasant, humorous women, gladdening the scene with their airy brightness and gladsome presence; but they have no comic energy. There has been no female Munden, Liston, Matthews, or Keeley. To be sure, our drama has no female parts, the representation of which after such a fashion would not have been a caricature.

But we must pursue this topic no further; and fear our readers may have been wondering how we have wandered away to it, from the theme which seemed to be suggested by the title of the work now before us. The explanation and apology is,



that we take Currer Bell to be one of the most remarkable of *female* writers; and believe it is now scarcely a secret that Currer Bell is the pseudonyme of a woman. An eminent contemporary, indeed, has employed the sharp vivacity of a female pen to prove 'upon irresistible evidence' that 'Jane Eyre' *must be* the work of a man! But all that 'irresistible evidence' is set aside by the simple fact that Currer Bell is a woman. We never, for our own parts, had a moment's doubt on the subject. That Jane herself was drawn by a woman's delicate hand, and that Rochester equally betrayed the sex of the artist, was to our minds so obvious, as absolutely to shut our ears to all the evidence which could be adduced by the erudition even of a *marchande des modes*; and that simply because we knew that there were women profoundly ignorant of the mysteries of the toilette, and the terminology of fashion (independent of the obvious solution, that such ignorance might be counterfeited, to mislead), and felt that there was no man who *could so* have delineated a woman — or *would so* have delineated a man. The fair and ingenious critic was misled by her own acuteness in the perception of details; and misled also in some other way, and more uncharitably, in concluding that the *author* of 'Jane Eyre' was a heathen educated among heathens, — the *fact* being, that the *authoress* is the daughter of a clergyman!

This question of authorship, which was somewhat hotly debated a little while ago, helped to keep up the excitement about 'Jane Eyre'; but, independently of that title to notoriety, it is certain that, for many years, there had been no work of such power, piquancy, and originality. Its very faults were faults on the side of vigour; and its beauties were all original. The grand secret of its success, however, — as of all genuine and lasting success, — was its *reality*. From out the depths of a sorrowing experience, here was a voice speaking to the experience of thousands. The aspects of external nature, too, were painted with equal fidelity, — the long cheerless winter days, chilled with rolling mists occasionally gathering into the strength of rains, — the bright spring mornings, — the clear solemn nights, — were all painted to your *soul* as well as to your eye, by a pencil dipped into a soul's experience for its colours. Faults enough the book has undoubtedly: faults of conception, faults of taste, faults of ignorance, but in spite of all, it remains a book of singular fascination. A more masculine book, in the sense of vigour, was never written. Indeed that vigour often amounts to coarseness, — and is certainly the very antipode to 'lady like.'

This same over-masculine vigour is even more prominent in 'Shirley,' and does not increase the pleasantness of the book.

A pleasant book, indeed, we are not sure that we can style it. Power it has unquestionably, and interest too, of a peculiar sort; but not the agreeableness of a work of art. Through its pages we are carried as over a wild and desolate heath, with a sharp east wind blowing the hair into our eyes, and making the blood tingle in our veins: There is health perhaps in the drive; but not much pleasantness. Nature speaks to us distinctly enough, but she does not speak sweetly. She is in her stern and sombre mood, and we see only her dreary aspects.

'Shirley' is inferior to 'Jane Eyre' in several important points. It is not quite so true; and it is not so fascinating. It does not so rivet the reader's attention, nor hurry him through all obstacles of improbability, with so keen a sympathy in its reality. It is even coarser in texture, too, and not unfrequently flippant; while the characters are almost all disagreeable, and exhibit intolerable rudeness of manner. In 'Jane Eyre' life was viewed from the standing point of individual experience; in 'Shirley' that standing point is frequently abandoned, and the artist paints only a panorama of which she, as well as you, are but spectators. Hence the unity of 'Jane Eyre' in spite of its clumsy and improbable contrivances, was great and effective: the fire of one passion fused the discordant materials into one mould. But in 'Shirley' all unity, in consequence of defective art, is wanting. There is no passionate link; nor is there any artistic fusion, or intergrowth, by which one part evolves itself from another. Hence its falling-off in interest, coherent movement, and life. The book may be laid down at any chapter, and almost any chapter might be omitted. The various scenes are gathered up into three volumes,—they have not grown into a work. The characters often need a justification for their introduction; as in the case of the three Curates, who are offensive, uninstructional, and unamusing. That they are not *inventions*, however, we feel persuaded. For nothing but a strong sense of their reality could have seduced the authoress into such a mistake as admitting them at all. We are confident she has seen them, known them, despised them; and *therefore* she paints them! although they have no relation with the story, have no interest in themselves, and cannot be accepted as types of a class,—for they are not *Curates* but *doors*; and although not inventions, we must be permitted to say that they are *not true*. Some such objection the authoress seems indeed to have anticipated; and thus towards the close of her work defends herself against it. 'Note well! wherever you present *the actual simple truth, it is some-how always denounced as a lie*: they disown it, cast it off, throw it on the parish; whereas the product of your imagination, the mere figment, the sheer fiction, is adopted, petted,

'termed pretty, proper, sweetly natural.' Now Currer Bell, we fear, has here fallen into a vulgar error. It is one, indeed, into which even Miss Edgeworth has also fallen: who conceived that she justified the introduction of an improbable anecdote in her text, by averring in a note that it was a 'fact.' But, the intrusion is not less an error for all that. Truth is never rejected, unless it be truth so exceptional as to stagger our belief; and in that case the artist is wrong to employ it, without so *preparing* our minds that we might receive it unquestioned. The coinage of imagination, on the other hand, is not accepted *because* it departs from the actual truth, but only because it presents the recognised attributes of our nature in new and striking combinations. If it falsify these attributes, or the known laws of their associations, the fiction is at once pronounced to be *monstrous*, and is rejected. Art, in short, deals with the broad principles of human nature, not with idiosyncracies; and, although it requires an experience of life both comprehensive and profound, to enable us to say with confidence, that '*this* motive is unnatural,' or '*that* passion is untrue,' it requires no great experience to say '*this* character has not the air of reality; it may be copied from nature, but it does not *look* so.' Were Currer Bell's defence allowable, all criticism must be silenced at once. An author has only to say that his characters *are copied from nature*, and the discussion is closed. But though the portraits may be like the oddities from whom they are copied, they are faulty as works of art, if they strike all who never met with these oddities, as unnatural. The curious anomalies of life, which find their proper niches in Southey's 'Omniara, or Common-place Book,' are not suitable to a novel. It is the same with incidents.

Again we say that 'Shirley' cannot be received as a work of art. It is not a picture; but a portfolio of random sketches for one or more pictures. The authoress never seems distinctly to have made up her mind as to what she was to do; whether to describe the habits and manners of Yorkshire and its social aspects in the days of King Lud, or to paint character, or to tell a love story. All are by turns attempted and abandoned; and the book consequently moves slowly, and by starts—leaving behind it no distinct or satisfactory impression. Power is stamped on various parts of it; power unmistakeable, but often misapplied. Currer Bell has much yet to learn,—and, especially, the discipline of her own tumultuous energies. She must learn also to sacrifice a little of her Yorkshire roughness to the demands of good taste: neither saturating her writings with such rudeness and offensive harshness, nor suffering her style to wander into such vulgarities as would be inexcusable—even in a man. No good critic will

object to the homeliness of natural diction, or to the racy flavour of conversational idiom; but every one must object to such phrases as 'Miss Mary, *getting up the steam* in her turn, now asked,' &c., or as 'making hard-handed worsted spinners *cash up to the tune of four or five hundred per cent.*,' or as 'Malone much chagrined at hearing him *pipe up in most superior style*;' all which phrases occur within the space of about a dozen pages, and that not in dialogue, but in the authoress's own narrative. And while touching on this minor, yet not trivial point, we may also venture a word of quiet remonstrance against a most inappropriate obtrusion of French phrases. When Gerard Moore and his sister talk in French, *which the authoress translates*, it surely is not allowable to leave scraps of French in the translation. A French word or two may be introduced now and then on account of some peculiar fitness, but Currer Bell's use of the language is little better than that of the 'fashionable' novelists. To speak of a grandmother as *une grand'mère*, and of treacle as *mélasse*, or of a young lady being angry as *courroucée*, gives an air of affectation to the style strangely at variance with the frankness of its general tone.

We scarcely know what to say to the impertinence which has been allowed to mingle so largely with the manners, even of the favourite actors in this drama. Their frequent harshness and rudeness is something which startles on a first reading, and, on a second, is quite inexplicable. Is this correct as regards Yorkshire, or is the fault with the artist? In one place she speaks with indignant scorn of those who find fault with Yorkshire manners; and defies the 'most refined of cockneys to presume' to do such a thing. 'Taken as they ought to be,' she assures us, 'the majority of the lads and lasses of the West Riding are gentlemen and ladies, every inch of them: and it is only against the weak affectation and futile pomposity of a would-be aristocrat that they even turn mutinous.' This is very possible; but we must in that case strongly protest against Currer Bell's portraits being understood to be resemblances; for they are, one and all, given to break out and misbehave themselves upon very small provocation. The manner and language of Shirley towards her guardian passes all permission. Even the gentle, timid, shrinking Caroline enters the lists with the odious Mrs. Yorke, and the two ladies talk at each other, in a style which, to southern ears, sounds both marvellous and alarming. But, to quit this tone of remonstrance, — which after all is a compliment, for it shows how seriously we treat the great talents of the writer, — let us cordially praise the real freshness, vividness, and fidelity, with which most of the characters and scenes are depicted.

There is, perhaps, no single picture representing one broad aspect of nature which can be hung beside two or three in 'Jane Eyre;' but the same piercing and loving eye, and the same bold and poetic imagery, are here exhibited.

How happy, for example, is this:—

'The evening was pitch dark: star and moon were quenched in gray rain-clouds,—gray they would have been by day; by night they looked sable. Malone was not a man given to close observation of nature; her changes passed for the most part unnoticed by him; he could walk miles on the most varying April day, and never see the beautiful dallying of earth and heaven,—never mark when a sunbeam kissed the hill-tops, *making them smile clear in green light, or when a shower wept over them*, hiding their crests with the low hanging dishevelled tresses of a cloud.'

How pictorial, again, is her notion of the sea:—

'I long to hear the sound of the waves—ocean waves!—and to see them as I have imagined them in dreams, *like tossing banks of green light, strewn with vanishing and reappearing wreaths of foam, whiter than lilies.*'

But one may remark how little the placid smile that rests on the grand calm face of nature in the fulness of life and abounding power, attracts the attention of the writer; and how much more readily the scenes of a dispiriting gloom, of stern, savage energy, or of wailing sadness, rivet her eye and solicit her pencil. The very force with which she depicts such scenes reveals her sympathies.

'There is only one cloud in the sky; but it curtains it from pole to pole. The wind cannot rest: it hurries sobbing over hills of sullen outline, colourless with twilight and mist. Rain has beat all day on that church tower: *it rises dark from the stony enclosure of its graveyard*; the nettles, the long grass, and the tombs all drip with wet.'

It gives one a chill to read such a passage! Here is another bit of storm landscape, worthy of a Backhuysen:—

'The thunder muttered distant peals; but the storm did not break till evening, after we had reached our inn; that inn being an isolated house at the foot of a range of mountains. I stood at the window an hour, watching the clouds come down over the mountains. The hills seemed rolled in sullen mist, and when the rain fell in *whitening sheets*, suddenly they were blotted from the prospect; they were *washed* from the world.'

The following interior is singularly graphic:—

'They had passed a long wet day together without *ennui*; it was now on the edge of dark; but candles were not yet brought in. Both, as twilight deepened, grew meditative and silent. A western wind

roared high round the hall, driving wild clouds and stormy rain up from the far-remote ocean : all was tempest outside the antique lattices, all deep peace within. Shirley sat at the window watching the rack in heaven, the mist on earth,—listening to certain notes of the gale that plained like restless spirits—notes which, had she not been so young, gay, and healthy, would have swept her trembling nerves like some omen, some anticipatory dirge : in this, her prime of existence and bloom of beauty, they but subdued vivacity to pensiveness. Snatches of sweet ballads haunted her ear ; now and then she sang a stanza : *and her accents obeyed the fitful impulse of the wind ;* they swelled as its gusts rushed on, and died as they wandered away. Caroline, withdrawn to the farthest and darkest end of the room, *her figure just discernible by the ruby shine of the flameless fire*, was pacing to and fro, murmuring to herself fragments of well-remembered poetry.

Similar power is manifested in the delineation of character : her eye is quick, her hand certain. With a few brief vigorous touches the picture starts into distinctness. Old Helstone, the copper-faced little Cossack parson, straight as a ramrod, keen as a kite ; Yorke, the hard, queer, clever, parson-hating, radical—Gentleman ; the benevolent Hall ; the fluttering, good, irresolute Mrs. Pryor ; the patient, frugal, beneficent old maid, Miss Ainley ; Hortense and Moore, and the Sympson family, —are all set with so much life before us, that we seem to *see* them moving through the rooms and across the moor. As a specimen of the nervous, compact writing which not unfrequently occurs to relieve the questionable taste of the rest, take the sentence describing the Sympsons :—

‘ Mr. Sympson proved to be a man of spotless respectability, worrying temper, pious principles, and worldly views. His lady was a very good woman, patient, kind, well-bred. She had been brought up on a narrow system of views—starved on a few prejudices ; a mere handful of bitter herbs.’

The two heroes of the book, however,—for there are two—are not agreeable characters ; nor are they felicitously drawn. They have both something sordid in their minds, and repulsive in their demeanour. Louis Moore is talked about as if he were something greater than our ordinary humanity ; but, when he shows himself, turns out to be a very small person indeed. Robert, more energetic, and more decisively standing out from the canvas, is disgraced by a sordid love of money, and a shameless setting aside of an affection for Caroline in favour of the rich heiress. *He* will be universally condemned : for all our better instincts rebel against him. The authoress will appeal in vain here to *the truth* of such sordidness—the truth of thus discarding a real passion in favour of an ambitious project. True it is : *true of many men ; but not true of noble natures*—not true of

an ideal of manhood. In a subordinate character such a lapse from the elevation of moral rectitude, might have been pardoned; but in a hero—in the man for whom our sympathies and admiration are almost exclusively claimed—to imagine it possible, is a decided blunder in art—as well as an inconsistency in nature. A hero may be faulty, erring, imperfect; but he must not be sordid, mean, wanting in the statelier virtues of our kind. Rochester was far more to be respected than this Robert Moore! Nor is Louis Moore much better. On any generous view of life there is almost as much sordidness in his exaggerated notions of Shirley's wealth, and of the *distance* it creates between his soul and hers, as there is in Robert's direct and positive greed of the money. That Louis, as a tutor, should be sensitive to any personal slight, should deeply feel that he was no 'match' for the heiress, we can readily understand; but if he thought so meanly of *her* as to suppose that her wealth was any barrier to her affection, then he was unworthy of her.

The heroines are more loveable. Shirley, if she did not occasionally use language one would rather not hear from the lips of a lady, and did not occasionally display something in her behaviour, which, with every allowance for Yorkshire plainness, does imply want of breeding,—Shirley, we say, would be irresistible. So buoyant, free, airy, and healthy in her nature, so fascinating in her manner, she is prettily enough described by her lover as a 'Peri too mutinous for heaven, too innocent for hell.' But if Shirley is, on the whole, a happy creation, Caroline Helstone, though sometimes remarkably sweet and engaging, is—if we may venture to say so—a failure. Currer Bell is exceedingly scornful on the chapter of heroines drawn by men. The cleverest and acutest of our sex, she says, are often under the strangest illusions about women—we do not read them in their true light; we constantly misapprehend them, both for good and evil. Very possibly. But we suspect that female artists are by no means exempt from mistakes quite as egregious when *they* delineate their sex; nay, we venture to say, that Mrs. Pryor and Caroline Helstone are as untrue to the universal laws of our common nature as if they had been drawn by the clumsy hand of a male: though we willingly admit that in both there are little touches which at once betray the more exquisite workmanship of a woman's lighter pencil.

Mrs. Pryor, in the capital event of her life—at least as far as regards this story—belies the most indisputable laws of our nature, in becoming an unnatural mother,—from some absurd prepossession that her child *must* be bad, wicked, and the cause of anguish to her, because it is pretty! The case is this. She

marries a very handsome man, who illtreats her; the fine gentleman turns out a brute. A child is born. This child, which universal experience forces us to exclaim must have been the darling consolation of its miserable mother; this child, over whom the mother would have wept scalding tears in secret, hugging it closer to her bosom to assure her fluttering heart, that in the midst of all her wretchedness, *this* joy remained, that in the midst of all the desolation of home, *this* exquisite comfort was not denied her:—yet this child, we are informed, she parts with, *because* it is pretty! ‘I feared your loveliness, deeming it the sign of perversity. They sent me your portrait, taken at eight years old; that portrait confirmed my fears. Had it shown me a sunburnt little rustic—a heavy, blunt-featured, commonplace child—I should have hastened to claim you; but there, under the silver paper, I saw blooming the delicacy of an aristocratic flower: “little lady” was written on every trait. . . . In my experience I had not met with truth, modesty, good principle, as the concomitants of beauty. A form so straight and fine, I argued, *must* conceal a mind warped and cruel!’ Really this is midsummer madness! Before the child had shown whether its beauty *did* conceal perversity, the mother shuts her heart against it! Curren Bell! if under your heart had ever stirred a child, if to your bosom a babe had ever been pressed,—that mysterious part of your being, towards which all the rest of it was drawn, in which your whole soul was transported and absorbed,—never could you have *imagined* such a falsehood as that! It is indeed conceivable—under some peculiar circumstances, and with peculiar dispositions—that the loathing of the wife for the husband, might extend to the child, because it was the husband’s child; the horror and hate being so intense as to turn back the natural current of maternal instincts; but to suppose that the mere beauty and ‘aristocratic’ air of an infant could so wrest out of its place a woman’s heart,—supposing her not irretrievably insane,—and for eighteen years keep a mother from her child, is to outrage all that we know of human nature.

Not quite so glaring, and yet very glaring, is the want of truth in Caroline. There are traits about this character quite charming; and we doubt not she will be a favourite with the majority of readers. But any one examining ‘Shirley’ as a work of art, must be struck with want of keeping in making the gentle, shy, not highly cultivated Caroline *talk* from time to time in the strain of Curren Bell herself rather than in the strain of Helstone’s little niece. We could cite several examples: the most striking perhaps is that long soliloquy at pages 269—274. of the second volume, upon the condition of women,—in which Caroline



takes a leaf out of Miss Martineau's book. The whole passage, though full both of thought and of eloquence, is almost ludicrously out of place. The apostrophes to the King of Israel, to the fathers of Yorkshire, and to the men of England, might have rounded a period in one of the authoress's own perorations; but to introduce them into a soliloquy by Caroline Helstone is an offence at once against art and against nature.

This, however, is but one point in the faulty treatment of the character. A graver error, — one implying greater forgetfulness of dramatic reality and probability, — is the conduct of Caroline in her love for Moore. The mystery kept up between the two girls is the trick of a vulgar novelist. Shirley must have set Caroline's mind at rest; *must* have said, 'Don't be unhappy about Moore and me; I have no love for him — nor he for me.' Instead of this, she is allowed to encourage the delusion which she cannot but perceive in Caroline's mind; But what is more incredible still, Caroline — who believes that Moore loves Shirley and will marry her — never once feels the sharp and terrible pang of jealousy! Now, unless we are to be put out of court as men, and consequently incompetent to apprehend the true nature of woman, we should say that this entire absence of jealous feelings on Caroline's part, is an omission, which, conscious or unconscious, we cannot reconcile with any thing we have ever seen, heard, or read of about the sex. That a girl like Caroline might be willing to resign her claims, might be willing even to submit in silence to the torture of her disappointment, is conceivable enough; and a fine theme might this have afforded for some profound psychological probings, laying open the terrible conflict of irrepressible instincts with more generous feelings, — the conflict of jealousy with reason. But Caroline Helstone merely bows her head in meekness, and loves and clings to Shirley all the more; never has even a moment's rebellion against her, and behaves like pattern young ladies in 'good' books!

We have been more than once disturbed by what looked like wilful departures from probability in this novel. We are by no means rigorous in expecting that the story is to move along the highway of every-day life. On the contrary, we are willing to allow the imagination full sweep; but we demand, that into whatever region it carry us, it must be at least consistent: if we are to travel into fairy land, it must be in a fairy equipage, *not* in a Hansom's cab. Now there are many regions in '*Shirley*' where we are glad enough to find ourselves; it is against the method by which we are transported to them that we protest. Thus in the second volume there is a really remarkable tirade about Milton's Eve: as an eloquent rhapsody we can scarcely

admire it too much; but, to be asked to believe that it was uttered in a quiet conversation between two young ladies, destroys half our pleasure. Let the reader judge for himself:—

“The gray church and grayer tombs look divine with this crimson gleam upon them. Nature is now at her evening prayers; she is kneeling before those red hills. I see her prostrate on the great steps of her altar, praying for a fair night for mariners at sea, for travellers in deserts, for lambs on moors, and unfledged birds in woods. Caroline, I see her! and I will tell you what she is like;—she is like what Eve was when she and Adam stood alone on earth.”

“And that is not Milton's Eve, Shirley.”

“Milton's Eve! Milton's Eve! I repeat. No, by the pure Mother of God, she is not! Cary, we are alone; we may speak what we think. Milton was great; but was he good? His brain was right; how was his heart? He saw Heaven; he looked down on Hell. He saw Satan, and Sin his daughter, and Death their horrible offspring. Angels serried before him their battalions: the long lines of adamantine shields flashed back on his blind eyeballs the unutterable daylight of heaven. Devils gathered their legions in his sight,—their dim, discrowned, and tarnished armies passed rank and file before him. Milton tried, too, to see the first woman; but, Cary, he saw her not.”

“You are bold to say so, Shirley.”

“Not more bold than faithful. *It was his cook that he saw!*—or it was Mrs. Gill, as I have seen her, making custards. In the heat of summer, in the cool dairy, with rose trees and nasturtiums about the latticed window, preparing a cold collation for the rector's preserves and ‘dulcet creams,’—puzzled ‘what choice to choose for delicacy best,—what order so contrived as not to mix tastes, not well-joined, inelegant; but bring taste after taste, upheld with kindest change.’”

“All very well too, Shirley.”

“I would beg to remind him that the first men of the earth were Titans, and that Eve was their mother! From her sprang Saturn, Hyperion, Oceanus,—she bore Prometheus.”

“Pagan that you are!—what does that signify?”

“I say, there were giants on the earth in those days,—giants that strove to scale heaven! The first woman's breast that heaved with life on this world nursed the daring which could contend with Omnipotence,—the strength which could bear a thousand years of bondage,—the vitality which could feed that vulture, Death, through uncounted ages,—the unexhausted life, and uncorrupted excellence, sisters to Immortality, which, after millenariums of crimes, struggles, and woes, could conceive and bring forth a Messiah. The first woman was heaven-born,—vast was the heart whence gushed the well-spring of the blood of nations, and grand the undegenerate head where rested the Consort Crown of creation.”

“She coveted an apple, and was directed by a snake; but you have got such a hash of Scripture and mythology into your head, that there is no making any sense of you. You have not yet told me what you saw kneeling on those hills.”

"I saw, I now see, a Woman—Titan! Her robe of blue air spreads to the outskirts of the heath, where yonder flock is grazing; a veil white as an avalanche, sweeps from her head to her feet, and arabesques of lightning flame on its borders. Under her breast I see her zone, purple like that horizon; *through* its blush shines the star of evening. Her steady eyes I cannot picture; they are clear—they are deep as lakes—they are lifted and full of worship—they tremble with the softness of love and the lustre of prayer! Her forehead has the expanse of a cloud, and is paler than the early moon, risen long before dark gathers; she reclines her bosom on the ridge of Stillbro' Moor; *her mighty hands are joined beneath it.* So kneeling, face to face she speaks with God! That Eve is Jehovah's daughter, as Adam was his son."

"She is very vague and visionary! Come, Shirley, we ought to go into church."

"Caroline, I will not; I will stay out here with my mother, Eve, in these days called Nature. I love her—undying, mighty being! Heaven may have faded from her brow, when she fell in Paradise; but all that is glorious on earth shines there still. She is taking me to her bosom, and showing me her heart. Hush, Caroline! you will see her and feel as I do, if we are both silent."

Then, again, there is Louis Moore writing long narratives in his note-book. *What* he writes is often striking; and had the authoress only thought of making him keep a journal, probability would have been sufficiently saved. But, instead of that, she obliges him to sit down in Shirley's room, draw out a note-book, and proceed to write very circumstantially, for our benefit, what every one feels he would never have *written* at all. And while writing he is so intensely conscious of being *read*, that he says, 'I confess it—to this mute page I may confess it—I have waited an hour in the court for the chance of seeing her. I have noticed (again, *it is to this page only I would make the remark*) that she will never permit any one but myself to render her assistance!' It is remarkable, too, that nothing whatever is gained by telling the story in this way. All that Louis Moore writes might have been better told by the authoress, without subterfuge. We may make the same remark as to Robert Moore's confession of his scene with Shirley. Its effect would be far truer. The attack on the Mill, too, instead of being described in the natural course of the narrative, is told us in snatches of dialogue between the two girls; who, in utter defiance of all *vraisemblance*, are calm spectators of that which they could not have seen. It is scarcely worth while to point out the several details in this scene, which betray a female and inexperienced hand. Incident is not the *forte* of Currer Bell. If her invention were in any degree equal to her powers of execution, (with a little more judgment and practice,) she would stand

alone among novelists; but in invention she is as yet only an artisan, not an artist.

As a proof of this poverty of invention we may refer again to the singular awkwardness of making Moore confess to Yorke the interview he had had with Shirley, and the terms on which he had offered to marry her. The scene is unquestionably very powerful; but it loses much of its power by the mode in which it is presented. Had it been narrated in the due course of the story, as in any other writer's hands it would have been, it would have been, perhaps, the most striking scene in the book. Such as it is, we give it, as another specimen of the peculiar character and ability displayed in it:—

“ I looked at her, Yorke; I saw in her, youth, and a species of beauty. I saw power in her. Her wealth offered me the redemption of my honour and my standing. I owed her gratitude. She had aided me substantially and effectually by a loan of five thousand pounds. Could I remember these things? Could I believe she loved me? Could I hear wisdom urge me to marry her, and yet disregard every dear advantage, disbelieve every flattering suggestion, disdain every well-weighed counsel, turn and leave her? Young, graceful, gracious,—my benefactress—*attached to me, enamoured of me*,—I used to say so to myself—dwell on the word—mouth it over and over again—swell over it with a pleasant, pompous complacency, with an admiration dedicated entirely to myself, and unimpaired even by esteem for her; indeed, I smiled in deep secrecy at her *naïveté* and simplicity, in being the first to love, and to show it! That whip of yours seems to have a good heavy handle, Yorke; you can swing it about your head and knock me out of the saddle, if you choose. At this moment I should rather relish a lounding whack!”

“ Take patience, Robert, till the moon rises, and I can see you. Speak plain out,—did you love her, or not? I should like to know; I feel curious.”

“ Sir,—Sir, I say,—she is very pretty in her own style, and very attractive. She has a look, at times, of a thing made out of fire and air, at which I stand and marvel; but without a thought of clasping and kissing it. I felt in her a powerful magnet to my interest and vanity; but I never felt as if Nature meant her to be my other and better self. When a question on that head rushed upon me I flung it off, saying, brutally, I should be rich with her, and ruined without her; vowing I would be practical, and not romantic.”

“ A very sensible resolve. What mischief came of it, Bob?”

“ With this sensible resolve I walked up to Fieldhead one night last August; it was the very eve of my departure for Birmingham,—for, you see, I wanted to secure Fortune's splendid prize; I had previously despatched a note, requesting a private interview. I found her at home, and alone.

“ She received me without embarrassment, for she thought I came on business. I was embarrassed enough, but determined. I hardly know how I got the operation over; but I went to work in

a hard, firm fashion,—frightful enough, I dare say. I sternly offered myself—my fine person—with my debts, of course, as a settlement!

"It vexed me; it kindled my ire to find that she neither blushed, trembled, nor looked down. She responded:—'I doubt whether I have understood you, Mr. Moore.'

"And I had to go over the whole proposal twice, and word it as plainly as A B C, before she would fully take it in.—And then what did she do? Instead of faltering a sweet 'Yes,' or maintaining a soft, confused, silence, which would have been as good, she started up, walked twice fast through the room, in the way that *she* only does and no other woman, and ejaculated,—'God bless me!'

"Yorke, I stood on the hearth, backed by the mantelpiece; against it I leaned, and prepared for any thing—every thing. I then knew my doom, and I knew myself. There was no misunderstanding her aspect and voice. She stopped and looked at me. 'God bless me!' she pitilessly repeated, in that shocked, indignant, yet saddened accent. 'You have made a strange proposal,—strange from *you*; and if you knew how strangely you worded it, and looked it, you would be startled at yourself. You spoke like a brigand who demanded my purse,—rather than like a lover who asked my heart!'

"A queer sentence, was it not, Yorke? And I knew as she uttered it, it was as true as queer. Her words were a mirror, in which I saw myself. I looked at her, dumb and wolfish; she at once enraged and ashamed me. She then said, 'Gérard Moore, you *know* you don't love Shirley Keeldar!'—I might have broken out into false swearing,—vowed that I did love her; But I could not lie in her pure face,—I could not perjure myself in her truthful presence. Besides, such hollow oaths would have been vain as void; she would no more have believed me than she would have believed the ghost of Judas, had he broken from the night and stood before her! Her female heart had finer perceptions than to be cheated into mistaking my half-coarse, half-cold admiration, for true throbbing manly love.

"What next happened? You will say, Mr. Yorke. Why, she sat down in the window-seat—and cried! She cried passionately; her eyes not only rained, but lightened. They flashed—open, large, dark, haughty—upon me; they said, 'You have pained me,—you have outraged me,—you have deceived me.'

"She added words soon to looks. 'I *did* respect, I *did* admire, I *did* like you,' she said; 'yes, as much as if you were my brother; and *you*—*you* want to make a speculation of me. You would immolate me to that mill—your Moloch!'

"I had the common sense to abstain from any word of excuse—any attempt at palliation; I stood to be scorned. Sold to the Devil for the time being, I was certainly infatuated: For when I did speak, what do you think I said? 'Whatever my own feelings were, I was persuaded *you* loved *me*, Miss Keeldar,' Beautiful!—was it not? She sat quite confounded.

"Is it Robert Moore that speaks?' I heard her mutter. 'Is it a man—or something lower?' 'Do you mean,' she asked aloud, 'do

you mean, you thought I loved you as we love those we wish to marry?’

“‘It was my meaning, and I said so.’

“‘You conceived an idea, then, obnoxious to a woman’s feelings,’ was her answer; ‘you have announced it in a fashion revolting to a woman’s soul! You insinuate, that all the frank kindness I have shown you has been a complicated, a bold, and an immodest manoeuvre to ensnare a husband! You imply, that at last you come here out of pity, to offer me your hand, because I have courted you! Let me say this;—Your sight is jaundiced,—you have seen wrong. Your mind is warped,—you have judged wrong. Your tongue betrays you,—you now speak wrong. I never loved you. Be at rest there. My heart is as pure of passion for you, as yours is barren of affection for me.’ I hope I was answered, Yorke?

“‘I seem to be a blind, besotted sort of person,’ was my remark.

“‘Loved you!’ she cried. ‘Why, I have been as frank with you as a sister,—never shunned you—never feared you. You cannot,’ she affirmed, triumphantly, ‘you cannot make me tremble with your coming, nor accelerate my pulse by your influence.’ \*

“‘I alleged, that often when she spoke to me she blushed, and that the sound of my name moved her. ‘Not for *your* sake,’ she declared, briefly. I urged explanation, but could get none.

“‘When I sat beside you at the school-feast, did you think I loved you then? When I stopped you in Maythorn Lane, did you think I loved you then? When I called on you in the counting-house—when I walked with you on the pavement—did you think I loved you then?’ So she questioned me; and I said, I did. By the Lord! Yorke, she rose—she grew tall—she expanded and refined almost to flame,—there was a trembling cold through her, as in live coal, when its vivid vermilion is hottest.

“‘That is to say, that you have the worst opinion of me,—that you deny me the possession of all I value most. That is to say, that I am a traitor to all my sisters,—that I have acted as no woman can act, without degrading herself and her sex,—that I have sought where the incorrupt of my kind naturally scorn and abhor to seek.’ She and I were silent for many a minute. ‘Lucifer Star of the Morning!’ she went on, ‘thou art fallen! You—once high in my esteem—are hurled down: you—once intimate in my friendship—are cast out. Go!’

“‘I went not. I had heard her voice tremble—seen her lip quiver. I knew another storm of tears would fall; and then I believed some calm and some sunshine must come, and I would wait for it.

“‘As fast, but more quietly than before, the warm rain streamed down. There was another sound in her weeping—a softer, more regretful sound. While I watched, her eyes lifted to me a gaze more reproachful than haughty—more mournful than incensed.

“‘Oh, Moore!’ said she, ‘it was worse than Et tu, Brute!’ I relieved myself by what should have been a sigh,—but it became a groan. A sense of Cain-like desolation made my breast ache. ‘There

has been error in what I have done,' I said; 'and it has won me bitter wages—which I will go and spend far from her who gave them.'

"I took my hat. All the time I could not have borne to depart so; and I believed she would not let me. Nor would she, but for the mortal pang I had given her pride. That choked her compassion, and kept her silent. I was obliged to turn back of my own accord, when I reached the door—to approach her, and to say, 'Forgive me.'

"I could, if there was not myself to forgive, too,' was her reply; 'for to mislead a sagacious man so far, I must have done wrong.' I broke out suddenly with some declamation I do not remember; I know that it was sincere, and that my wish and aim were to absolve her to herself; in fact, in her case, self-accusation was a chimera.

"At last she extended her hand. For the first time I wished to take her in my arms and kiss her. I *did* kiss her hand many times. 'Some day we shall be friends again,' she said, 'when you have had time to read my actions and motives in a true light, and not so horribly to misinterpret them. Time may give you the right key to all; then, perhaps, you will comprehend me, and then we shall be reconciled.'

"Farewell! drops rolled slow down her cheeks,—she wiped them away. 'I am sorry for what has happened—deeply sorry,'—she sobbed. So was I, God knows! And thus were we severed."

Did space permit, we would gladly quote the *ἀναγνώσις* of Mother and Daughter,—in its simple, humble, thrilling naturalness one of the most touching and *feminine* scenes in our literature; or that wild, imaginative, and original picture of the Mermaid, which shows the writer to have the true poetic power—the power, namely, of creating new life out of old materials. Surely at the present day one would think there was nothing more to be said about mermaids; yet we venture to say that mermaids never were so beautiful, so ghastly, so living, as in this description—which, after all, we must squeeze in:—

"I suppose you expect to see mermaids, Shirley?" said Caroline.

"One, certainly, at all events. I am to be walking by myself on deck, rather late of an August evening, watching and being watched by a full harvest moon. Something is to rise white on the surface of the sea, over which that moon mounts silent, and hangs glorious. The object glitters for an instant, and sinks. It rises again. I think I hear it cry, with an articulate voice. I call you up from the cabin,—I show you an image, fair and smooth as alabaster, emerging from the dim wave. We both see the long hair—the lifted and foam-white arm—the oval mirror, brilliant as a star. It glides nearer; a human face is plainly visible—a face in the style of yours—whose straight, pure (excuse the word, it is appropriate,) lineaments paleness does not disfigure. It looks at us, but not with your eyes: I see a preternatural lure in the wily glance. It beckons. Were we *men* we should spring at the sign, and the cold billows would be dared for the sake of the colder enchantress; but being women we stand safe—

though not dreadless. She comprehends our unmoved gaze: she feels herself powerless: anger crosses her front. She cannot charm, but she will appal us! She rises high, and glides all revealed on the dark wave ridge. Temptress—terror! monstrous likeness of ourselves! Are you not glad, Caroline, when at last, with a wild shriek, she dives?"

Our closing word shall be one of exhortation. Schiller, writing to Goethe about Madame de Stael's 'Corinne,' says, 'This person wants every thing that is graceful in a woman; and, nevertheless, the faults of her book are altogether womanly faults. She steps out of her sex—without elevating herself above it.\*' This brief and pregnant criticism is quite as applicable to Currer Bell: For she, too, has genius enough to create a great name for herself; and if we seem to have insisted too gravely on her faults, it is only because we are ourselves sufficiently her admirers to be most desirous to see her remove these blemishes from her writings, and take the rank within her reach. She has extraordinary power—but let her remember that '*on tombe du côté où l'on penche!*'

ART. VI.—*Négociations de la France dans le Levant; ou Correspondance, Mémoires, et Actes Diplomatiques des Ambassadeurs de France à Constantinople, et des Ambassadeurs, Envoyés, ou Résidents à divers titres à Venise, Raguse, Rome, Malte, et Jerusalem; en Turquie, Perse, Géorgie, Crimée, Syrie, Egypte, etc. et dans les états de Tunis, d'Alger, et de Maroc. Publiés pour la première fois. Par S. CHARRIÈRE. Tome I. (1515—1547). Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1848.*

THREE centuries ago, the first vow of Christian statesmen was the expulsion of the Turks from the city of Constantine, and the deliverance of Europe from the scourge and terror of the infidel. In the present age, the absorbing desire of the same cabinets is to maintain the misbelievers in their settlements; and to postpone, by all known expedients of diplomacy and menace, the hour at which the Crescent must again give place to the Cross. The causes and progress of this curious revolution of sentiment we now purpose to trace; and to ascertain, if possible, by what sequence of events, and changes of opinion

\* 'Es fehlt dieser Person an jeder schönen Weiblichkeit, dagegen sind die Fehler des Buchs vollkommen weibliche Fehler. Sie tritt aus ihrem Geschlecht ohne sich darüber zu erheben.'—*Briefwechsel*, iv. p. 243.



such conditions of public policy have at length been accredited among us.

It will naturally be presumed that the clouds now actually gathering on the Eastern heavens have suggested both our disquisition and its moral; nor, indeed, should we, without reasonable warrant for such an introduction of the subject. But we feel it would be here perilous to prophesy the dissolution of a State which has now been, for five generations, in its nominal agony. We believe we might venture to assert that no Christian writer has treated of Ottoman history, who did not seek in the sinking fortunes or impending fall of the Empire the point and commendation of his tale. Knolles thankfully recounted the signs of its decline two hundred and fifty years ago. Cantemir discoursed of 'the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire,' while even Poland was still a powerful kingdom. As the eighteenth century wore on, such reflections became both more justifiable and more frequent; and, as the *artificial* existence of Turkey was hardly yet anticipated, the close of its *natural* term seemed within the limits of easy calculation. Even the end of the great war, which left so many crumbling monarchies repaired and strengthened, brought no similar relief to the House of Osman. Excluded, on the contrary, from the arrangements of the great European settlement, Turkey remained exposed to worse perils than any which had yet beset her. In the great peace of Europe there was no peace for Constantinople. Thirty years since, the historian of the Middle Ages expected, 'with an assurance that none can deem extravagant, the approaching subversion of the Ottoman power;' and the progressive current of events has certainly in no degree changed, since this conviction was avowed. Yet, though the only symptom of imminent dissolution that then seemed wanting has now appeared, and though territorial dismemberment has partially supervened upon internal disorganisation, the imperial fabric still stands—the Turkish Crescent still glitters on the Bosphorus—and still 'the tottering arch of conquest spans the ample regions from Bagdad to Belgrade.'

Without repeating, therefore, the ominous note of prophecy, we shall direct our remarks to the historical elucidation of the questions involved in it. Our wish is to illustrate the origin and establishment of the Ottoman Empire, as one of the substantive Powers of Europe; to exhibit the causes which conduced to its political recognition; to trace the subsequent action of so anomalous a State upon the affairs of Christendom; to mark the fluctuations of fortune by which its external relations were determined; and to distinguish the stages of estimation and

influence through which it successively passed, until the dreaded Empire of the Ottomans dwindled virtually, though with dominions not materially diminished, into the position of a *Protected State*,—subsisting, apparently, by the interested patronage of those very Powers which had been so scared and scandalised at its growth. If our inquiry should include fewer exemplifications than might be expected of the civil institutions of this extraordinary nation, the omission must be attributed to the extent of the more immediate subject, and the imperative restrictions of space. A sagacious moralist once said of an historian of the Turks, that he was unhappy only in the choice of his matter. If the course of our proposed exposition were but a little less narrow, we should not distrust our ability to cancel this invidious qualification; for there are, in reality, no known annals more striking in their details, and often more purely romantic than those of the House of Othman. Even as it is, we hope for some success; for, though of all kinds of history political history possesses the fewest superficial attractions, yet such topics as the naturalisation of a Mahometan sovereignty among the States of Christendom—the varying phases of religious zeal—the conflict of traditional duties and practical policy—and the rise and growth of such an element as the power of the Czars—should command their share of interest and attention.

It may reasonably be thought remarkable that the establishment of an infidel Power at the gates of Europe should not, in those ages of faith, have provoked a prompt and effective combination of the whole Christian world for the expulsion of the intruder. In explanation, however, of this apathy or impotence, there are several considerations to be mentioned. In the first place, the phenomenon coincided singularly, in point of time, with the definite abandonment of the system of Eastern crusades. The seventh and last of these enterprises had resulted in scandal and defeat; and had disclosed the growing reluctance of States and people to contribute towards expeditions which neither promoted the objects nor conduced to the credit of those engaged in them. The final and total loss of the Holy Land in 1291, preceded but by eight years the enthronement of the first Othman; so that the origin of the Turkish State was almost exactly contemporaneous with the withdrawal of Christian arms from the scene of its growth. That the extinction, too, of the crusading principle was then complete, may be inferred from the violent suppression, only ten years later, of that military order which had been mainly instrumental in checking the march of the misbelievers. The commencement of the Ottoman dynasty is placed in the year

1299; and, in the year 1309, the Knights Templars, except as captives or pensioners, had ceased to exist. Nor was the rise of the Turkish power an event calculated, at its first announcement, to create any extraordinary consternation. As regards Asia Minor, the entire peninsula, with the exception of its western sea-board, had long been in the possession of kindred tribes; and the mere substitution of Ottomans for Seljukians could hardly be thought to menace the interests of Europe. Even the actual passage of the Straits, which was the first critical point of Turkish progress, presented no unparalleled phenomenon; for a Moorish kingdom still flourished on the Guadalquivir; and a Tartar horde had just established its sovereignty over the dismembered duchies of Russia. It is certainly true that the exigencies of Mogul invasions, and the remnants of crusading zeal, did originally suggest the concert of nations, which became afterwards systematised by the standing requirements of a political equilibrium; and, perhaps, the dread of Ottoman aggression produced the first faint foreshadowings of those State-combinations which characterise the modern history of Europe. But it was not so at the outset. Adrianople had been made a Mahometan capital, and the metropolis of the Eastern Cæsars had become a mere *enclave* in Turkish territory, before the aid of European princes was solicited against the new invaders — and solicited in vain! and when at length the Christian allies and the infidel forces joined battle in the field of Nicopolis, the Ottoman power had been impregably strengthened by the impunity and successes of a century.

As any particular narrative of these events would carry us beyond our limits and our design, we can only venture on a few brief remarks in elucidation of the subject directly before us, and in aid of the general interest of our disquisition. Towards the close of the thirteenth century, — that is to say, at the very moment when the election of a Swiss knight to the Germanic throne was laying the foundations of the imperial House of Austria, events of equal singularity were preparing the seat of the rival Cæsars for the progeny of a Turkish free-booster. The Asiatic continent, from its central highlands to the shores of the Mediterranean, had been utterly convulsed by the tremendous irruptions of Zingis Khan; and, in the course of the subsequent commotions, a Turcoman chief named Ortogrul, from the banks of the Oxus, found himself wandering in the hills of Anatolia at the head of four hundred families. A service, which he accidentally rendered to a native prince, was acknowledged by a grant of land; and the estate was soon expanded into a respectable territory, by the talents which had originally acquired

it. The inheritance of Ortoğrul devolved, in 1289, upon his son Osman or Othman, who, at the death, ten years later, of his patron, the Sultan of Iconium, no longer hesitated to proclaim his independent sovereignty. Such was the origin of the House of Othman. The name itself, which is a vernacular epithet of the royal vulture, and signifies a 'bone-breaker,' has been recognised by the Turks as not disagreeably symbolical of the national character and mission; and so completely do they identify their State with the race of its founder, that they have foregone all other denominations for the dignity, style, and title of the Ottoman Porte.

The new dynasty enjoyed the signal though accidental advantages of long reigns and worthy representatives; while its opportunities of aggrandisement were so peculiar that far weaker hands might have turned them to account. On one side of them lay the Roman empire, shrunk to the dimensions of Constantinople and its environs; on the other the fragmentary or effete principalities of the Seljukian Turks, who had been quartered for two centuries on these spoils of the Eastern Cæsars, and whose power had been recently shattered by the shock of the Mogul invasion. The House of Othman struck right and left. Before the sixty years of its two first chiefs had terminated, the north-western portions of Asia Minor had been effectually subdued, and a capital had been found at Prusa for the new dominion. Already the passage of the Hellespont had become an ordinary incident of their expeditions, and by the middle of the fourteenth century, the European shore of the Straits was studded with Turkish garrisons. Starting from the ground thus gained, Amurath, first of his name and third of his race, added the whole province of Thrace to his territories, erected a second metropolis at Adrianople, and advanced the Ottoman frontiers to the Balkan. Our sketch runs rapidly to a close. A few years more, and we find these Turks of the third generation, at the very limits of their present empire; and on the very scenes of their present fortunes. By 1390, they had occupied Widdin, and before five years more had elapsed, the Moslem and Christian hosts were delivering, as we have said, the first of their countless battles on the banks of the Danube.

During these transactions, although the relative positions of Turkey and Christendom were wholly and alarmingly changed, and though the attitude of the new invaders on the borders of Germany did really portend more serious results than the transient devastations of Tartar inroads, yet the deportment of the European Powers appears to have undergone no corresponding

alteration. The battle of Nicopolis had indeed been fought; but the crusade which this encounter commenced and terminated, originated rather in the influence of family connexions than in any impulse of political foresight or religious zeal. The King of Hungary, whose realm was menaced by the arms of Bajazet I., was son of one German emperor, brother to another, and destined to be Emperor himself; and he possessed therefore the obvious means of attracting to his standard the capricious chivalry of the West. But there was no effective combination of forces, nor any permanent sense of the danger which required it. The progress of the Ottoman arms exercised little perceptible influence on the councils of Europe, nor did the impending fate of an imperial and Christian city provoke any serviceable sympathy. After the Thracian and Bulgarian conquests, to which we have alluded, Constantinople, for the first time in its existence, was completely environed by enemies; and it became clear to the Greek emperors, that the invaders with whom they had now to deal, were of a very different mould from the swarming hordes, which had so often swept past them and retired. Yet, though four emperors in succession visited Western Europe in search of aid, and though one of them brought his petition even to the king of this island, and Kentish yeomen saw a Greek Cæsar entertained in St. Austin's monastery, and received on Blackheath by a Lancastrian sovereign, there was no substantial aid forthcoming. This failure was doubtless principally ascribable to the disrepute into which crusading expeditions had fallen, and to the occupation with which both the French and English monarchs were then provided in their own kingdoms. There are, however, other circumstances which, for the full comprehension of the state of opinion at this period, it will be necessary to recollect.

Though the Greek emperors were not only Christian sovereigns, but even coheirs of the political supremacy of Christendom, yet this very rivalry had combined with their geographical isolation and foreign tongue to estrange them from the Powers of Europe. As early as the reign of Heraclius, the intercourse between the East and West began visibly to slacken, and the great religious schism of the eleventh century completed the disruption. After this time, Constantinople was scarcely regarded, either spiritually or politically, as entering into the community of European States. Even the contact induced by the Crusades rather increased than diminished the alienation. On more than one occasion, Greek emperors were leagued with the Saracens against the soldiers of the Cross; and the imperial city itself, after triumphantly sustaining so many

sieges, was captured and sacked for the first time by Christians and Franks. It may be imagined, perhaps, that the differences between the Greek and Latin churches could not much affect the dispositions of Norman barons; but it must be remembered, that in these romantic expeditions the moderator and exponent of European opinion was no other than the Roman Pontiff, — without whose co-operation it would have been scarcely possible to organise an effectual crusade. The application, therefore, of the Eastern emperors to the Powers of Europe, took the form of conciliatory overtures to the Romish See; and, excepting in the case of the Emperor Manuel, the negotiations of the imperial visitors were confined to the limits of the Papal Court. Neither could the Greek State be exactly represented to European sympathies as a Christian city brought finally to bay, and desperately battling against the overwhelming forces of the infidel. The terms on which Turks and Greeks had for some time been living, precluded any such description of their mutual relationship. The presumptive antagonism of the two States had been long openly compromised by concessions, by tributes, and, what was worse, by the ordinary passages of amity and good-will. Ottoman princes were educated at the Christian court, and Christian princes honourably lodged in the camp of the Ottomans; a mosque was tolerated in Constantinople; and a daughter of John Cantacuzene was given in marriage to the second of the Turkish sovereigns. That these arrangements were not wholly voluntary on the side of the weaker party we may safely believe; but it will still be evident how materially such a combination of circumstances must have operated to the disadvantage of the Emperors, in their appeal to the sympathy of Christian Europe.

Meantime the Turkish power had been growing with a certainty and steadiness unexampled in the history of an Oriental people. Two or three of the causes which principally conduced to this remarkable result, it may be right here to specify. The passage of the Ottomans into Europe might have been long retarded by the simple expedient of guarding the Straits. While the power of the Greek Empire consisted almost solely in the relics of its fleet, still respectably appointed, and furnished with the most formidable appliances of naval warfare known to the age, the Turks were totally destitute both of ships and of the science which concerned them. A few galleys might have sufficiently protected the channel against all the forces of Orchan and Amurath; and yet not only were the Ottomans permitted to pass undisturbed, with such means as they could extemporise, but even the intelligence of their having secured

a lodgement, and fortified themselves on the European side produced nothing but careless scoffs in the Imperial court. The next point requiring notice is, that the conquests of the Turks were mainly effected by the agency of European troops. The Ottomans will be found to have conquered the Byzantine provinces as we conquered India,—by enlisting and disciplining the natives of the country. Only 400 families had originally obeyed the voice of Ortogrul; and it is clear, therefore, that the subjects of his successors must have been swelled in numbers by accessions from other tribes: in fact, the progress of the Ottomans was merely the onward flow of the population of Asia Minor. Even this, however, would have been deficient in impulsive force, but for the singular institution which we are now to mention.

The Janizaries were originally formed and recruited from the impressed children of Christian captives; afterwards from those of any Christian subjects of the Porte, and at length from the sons of the soldiers themselves; so that a pure military caste, with habits and interests totally distinct from the rest of the people, was gradually established in the very heart of the nation. The number of the Janizaries in the middle of the fourteenth century was only one thousand; but this muster-roll was repeatedly multiplied by successive Emperors, till at length, under the Great Solyman, it reached to twenty thousand, and in the German wars, under Mahomed IV., to double that strength. It is not a little singular that a body so constituted should have been not only the main instrument of Turkish aggrandisement, but should have been so inveterately identified with Ottoman traditions, as at all times to have formed the chief obstacle to any social or constitutional reforms. Nor should it be overlooked, that the creation and maintenance of this standing army, isolated from all popular sympathies by descent and character, contributed most powerfully to consolidate the authority of the new dynasty, and to furnish the Turkish sovereigns with those permanent resources, in virtue of which they escaped the ordinary vicissitudes of Oriental dynasties; and encountered the tumultuous levies of Hungary and Germany with all the advantages of despotic power. The pretensions of the House of Othman kept pace with its achievements. Originally its chief had been content with the title of Emir; but Bajazet I., by means to which we shall immediately refer, procured for himself, towards the end of the century, the more dignified denomination of Sultan. Already, in justification of his new assumptions, had he invested Constantinople, when events occurred by which the very course of Fate itself appeared to be threatened with a change. We can

do no more than specify in a few words the occurrences which abruptly subverted the whole superstructure of Turkish power; which scattered all its acquisitions to the winds, and which render its ultimate restoration one of the most extraordinary incidents in the records of history.

In the height of his power and presumption, Bajazet was conquered and carried into captivity by Timour. By this defeat the inheritance of his house became to all appearance entirely dissolved. Its Asiatic possessions, though contemptuously abandoned by the conqueror, were seized upon by the Seljukian Turks; who regained the positions from which they had been dislodged; while in Europe the opportunity was turned to similar account by the reviving spirit of the Greeks. To complete the ruin, civil war between the sons of Bajazet presently ensued; and the heirs of the Ottoman House, instead of repairing their fortunes by concord and patience, were fighting desperately among themselves, for a heritage which hardly existed save in name. The perfect restoration of a State, dismembered and dismantled, at such a stage of its existence, by so destructive and shattering a shock, may be described as without parallel in history—and yet within ten years it was completely effected. Mahomet, the most sagacious of the sons of Bajazet, waited his time; and at length, by the extinction of other claims, succeeded in recovering both the Asiatic and European conquests of his family, and in reuniting the thrones of Adrianople and Prusa. A peaceful and prudent reign of eight years enabled him to consolidate his dominion anew; and when in 1421, Amurath II. succeeded to the crown of his father, the Ottoman Power was as vigorous, as sound, and as aggressive as if the battle of Angora had never been fought.

We are now arrived at a period when the destinies of the Ottoman House were to be finally determined. Up to this time the progress and renown of the Turkish arms had stimulated Europe to nothing but a few insincere leagues and a single precipitate crusade; nor can we be wrong in presuming that the recent temporary suspension and apparent annihilation of the Ottoman Power must have operated materially in still further indisposing European statesmen to exertion or alarm. But the capture of Constantinople by Mahomet II., in 1453, changed the whole aspect of affairs. It has been usual to describe this memorable event as one of those which mark a new epoch; and as serving to introduce that period of history which we now emphatically term Modern. Undoubtedly, the definite and final extinction of the Roman Empire and the diffusion of Greek literature were incidents of no ordinary note; but by far the most important



consequences of Mahomet's success were those which affected the Ottomans themselves. As regards Europe, it cannot be said that the destruction of the Lower Empire left any perceptible void in the community of States. As no system of mutual relationship had yet been established among Christian Powers, no special disturbance, such as would in the present day follow on the extinction of a particular member, could then be expected to ensue; and, even in the partial and transient examples of concert which had occasionally occurred, Constantinople had long been without appreciable influence or consideration. Since, therefore, no European functions had been discharged by the Lower Empire, no positive loss could be felt from its destruction; nor was the capture of Constantinople of much greater significance, in this respect, than the capture of Delhi. But, as affecting the rising power of the Ottomans, the event was of most material importance. It created, as it were, a vacancy in the list of recognised monarchies, and delivered over to a State, which already wanted little but a seat of central power, one of the oldest and most famous capitals of Europe. It gave to the House of Othman, in a single day, exactly the *status* which it needed; and which years of successful invasions and forays would have failed to secure. It precluded all future antagonism between Adrianople and Prusa; and established a permanent cohesion between the European and Asiatic dominions of the Turkish crown. More than this—it conveyed to the Sultans and their successors certain traditional pretensions, of which they soon discovered the value. The empire of the East, according to their assertions, had neither been terminated nor dissolved, but had merely passed, like other kingdoms of the earth, to stronger and more deserving possessors. They claimed to represent the majesty of Constantine, and to inherit his dominion. From such presumptions it was easy to derive warrants, if warrants were needed, for war against the Venetians, whose possessions in the Archipelago and the Levant were but spoils ravished from the declining strength of Constantinople; or against the Germans, whose rival pretensions to imperial supremacy were easily impugned. To the other titles of the Ottoman sovereigns was now added, accordingly, that of Keesar of Roum; and they were furnished, independently of the standing dictates of their religion, with pretexts of some plausibility for carrying their aggressive arms across the Adriatic.

We should probably not be justified in attributing to any accurate perception of these risks, the anxiety and terror which are described as pervading the courts of Christendom at the

final intelligence of this catastrophe. There was serious agitation in Rome, considerable alarm on the Danube, and great scandal every where. A Christian capital of ancient name and famous memory had been sacked by an unbelieving race, whose name for generations past had been the horror of Europe. Yet, abruptly as the blow was at last felt to descend, it had long been visibly suspended; and, although no human power could have permanently protected the Greek Cæsars in their capital, while the Turks were established in unquestioned sovereignty between the Danube and the Euphrates, the actual circumstances of the siege were, nevertheless, such as to cast heavy imputation and responsibility upon the Powers of Europe. The Imperial city had been allowed to sustain the full shock of the Ottoman forces, with a weak and inadequate garrison of eight thousand men, three-fourths of whom were supplied from the population within the walls; so that the chivalry of Christendom was represented, at this critical period, by two thousand auxiliaries! Yet, that there was both room and opportunity for effectual succour, was evident, not only from the manner in which the defence, even under such circumstances, was protracted, but from the diversion which had been accomplished, during Bajazet's investment, by a force of only six hundred men-at-arms, and twice as many archers, under Marshal Boucicault.

But the truth was, that, although the actual catastrophe created a momentary consternation, and even occasioned the revival in certain quarters of crusading vows, there existed, as we have already said, no fellow-feeling with the Greeks sufficiently strong to suggest an effective expedition; nor in fact any facilities for such an enterprise in the social or political condition of Europe. The Turks were no new enemies; nor were they now seen for the first time on the northern shore of the Straits. The resources of Christendom might admit of combination and exertion in the event of an actual irruption of barbarians or infidels, as when Frederic II. repulsed the Moguls, or Charles V. scared the Ottomans under the great Solymán; but for aggressive enterprise in distant regions they were no longer available. The writings of Æneas Sylvius — one of the earliest statesmen who surveyed the several Powers of Europe in connexion with each other — give an intelligible picture of the condition of affairs at this period. The fall of Constantinople had excited some sympathies, but more selfishness. A certain commiseration, quickened by the refugees dispersed over the countries of the West, was felt for the exiled Greeks; but a far more lively sentiment was excited by the demonstrations of the triumphant Ottoman against the Italian peninsula. So reasonable were the

apprehensions on this head made to appear, that within twelve months of the capture of the city, war was actually declared against the new Empire of the East in the Frankfort Diet; and, five years later, it was formally resolved at the Congress of Mantua, that 50,000 confederate soldiers should be equipped for the expulsion of the infidel, and the conclusive deliverance of Christendom. Neither of these designs, however, proceeded beyond the original menace; and the Turks were left in undisputed possession of their noble spoil.

Between this turning point of Turkish destinies, and the new epoch to which we must now direct our attention, there intervened a period of great general interest, and of remarkable importance to the Ottoman Empire—but not inducing any material changes in the relations of this Power with Western Europe. The avowed designs of Mahomet II. upon the capital of Christendom, illustrated as they were by his attitude on the Danube and his actual lodgement at Otranto, were not indeed without their influence, as was shown by the multitude of volunteers who flocked to the standard of the intrepid Hunniades. But when the idea of Ottoman invincibility had been corrected by the victories of the Allies at Belgrade, by the successful defiance of Scanderbeg, and by the triumphant resistance of the Knights of Rhodes, this restlessness soon subsided, and the course of events became presently such as to substitute new objects of concern in European counsels for the power and progress of the Turks. Perhaps the wild and indefinite projects of Charles VIII., in that gigantic national foray upon Italy which disorganised the mediæval constitution of Europe, may be taken as a fair representation of the ideas prevailing respecting Constantinople, thirty years after the fall of the city. If the forces of France and Spain, instead of contending in deadly struggles for the possession of Italy, had been combined against a common enemy upon the Hellespont, it is certainly possible that something might have been achieved. The great Gonzalvo did, indeed, once appear upon the scene as an ally of the Venetians, and with an effect proportionate to his reputation. But in computing the chances of any such enterprise, it must be remembered that the Turks had hitherto achieved their conquests, not by mere force of numbers, like the Tartar hordes, but by superiority of discipline, tactics, equipments, and science. In this respect, at least, they were no barbarians. Their army was incomparably the strongest in Europe,—and especially in those departments which indicate the highest military excellence. For many years afterwards, their artillery and engineers surpassed those of the best appointed European troops. These

advantages would have told with tenfold effect from such ramparts as those of Constantinople, while nothing, on the other hand, short of a recapture of the city, and a complete dislodgement of the intruders, could have effected the objects of the Christian Powers. Above all, it should be recollected, what was so clearly proved in the sequel, that these Powers could not then be relied on for any steadiness of concert, or any integrity of purpose; and that the religious zeal of former days was certainly not now in sufficient strength to furnish an extraordinary bond of union. The Turks were no longer politically regarded as the common foes, either of the human race or the Christian name. Already had the ordinary transactions of bargains and contracts become familiar between them and the Venetians; dealings of a more degrading kind had compromised the Papal See, and the Ottoman arms had in various expeditions been repeatedly aided by small Christian succours. It is related, indeed, that high pay and liberal encouragement attracted recruits from all countries to the Turkish ranks; nor is there, we believe, much reason to doubt that many an European Dalgetty was serving under the standard of the Prophet. The number of renegade vizirs and pashas that have figured in the Turkish service is something extraordinary.

To these considerations must be added the fact, that during the seventy years thus interposed between the capture of Constantinople and the accession of the Great Solymán, the designs of Ottoman ambition had been diverted from the North and West to the East and South—from the shores of the Adriatic and the Danube to the defiles of Armenia and the plains of Cairo. Though the supremacy of the Turks was, it is true, steadily supported on the scene of its recent triumphs, and even unusually signalised on the waters of the Archipelago, yet the chief efforts of the two immediate successors of Mahomet were concentrated upon the territories of Persia and Egypt. It does not enter into our present plan to discuss the interesting results with which these efforts were attended. We need only remark, that while the overthrow of the Mameluke dynasty and the conquest (in 1516) of the kingdom of Egypt, compensated for the less productive invasions of the Persian provinces, the two objects together combined to divert the attention of the Sultans from Europe, and to suspend, for an interval, the apprehensions of Christendom. Looking back, therefore, for a moment from the point which we have now attained, we can see that the first rise of the Ottoman power occurred at such a period and under such circumstances as to deprive the phenomenon of any great singularity or terror; that even the

passage of the Turks into Europe, their appearance on the Danube, and the permanent investment of Constantinople which virtually ensued, exercised no proportionate influence on the opinions of Western Europe, wearied as it was with crusades, and detached as it had long practically been from any civil or religious intercourse with the Greeks of the Lower Empire; and that the Ottoman invaders thus finally stepped without material opposition into an imperial inheritance, — which supplied them opportunely and in full perfection with what they most needed for the consolidation of their conquests — a local habitation and a recognised name among the Powers of Europe. But for the occupation of Constantinople, the dominion of the Ottomans might possibly have been little more durable than the dominion of the Horde on the Don. Lastly, we may remark, that the power of resistance to further aggression developed at Belgrade, and exemplified by the evacuation of Otranto, contributed, in connexion with the diversion of Turkish conquests to other quarters of the globe, to reassure the kingdoms of the West; and to prepare the way for the eventual admission of a Mahometan Power into the political community of Christian States. Some of the earlier causes conducive to this remarkable consummation we have already pointed out; but others, of no inferior interest, remain yet to be noticed.

In the month of February, 1536, the nations of Europe were scandalised — we may still employ the expression — with the intelligence that a treaty of amity and concord had been struck, between the Grand Seignior of the Turks and the first king of the Christian world! At an earlier period, Francis I. of France had not hesitated to enter into one of those nominal leagues against the Turk, which decency was still thought occasionally to dictate, and of which it was the immediate interest of Charles V. to perpetuate the spirit. But the ease and readiness with which these considerations were now subordinated to the very first suggestions of practical policy, furnish edifying matter of observation. The political system of European States, — that is to say, the system in pursuance of which a reciprocal relationship is established between the several members of the community for the preservation of a general equilibrium, — was then in process of formation; and a more curious example of its tendencies could hardly be given than this which we are now attempting to represent, in which the single idea contained in the term ‘balance of power’ sufficed, first, to introduce an infidel State into the company of Christian sovereigns; secondly, to bring aid and countenance to that State in its very aggres-

sions ; and, lastly, when the course of events had hastened the premature hour of its decline, to protect its weakness, to assert its cause against even Christian adversaries, and to guarantee it, long, apparently, beyond the proper term, in a political and national existence.

The system of which we have been speaking, took its rise, or, at least, assumed its first practical developments, from the rivalry between France and Spain. The aggrandisement and consolidation which each of these kingdoms, though in an unequal degree, had recently attained, constituted them 'the two crowns' of Christendom. The antagonism naturally ensuing between Powers thus situated, soon drew the other States of Europe into its sphere of action. This rivalry had been first exemplified in the Italian wars which followed upon the expedition of Charles VIII., and it was continued entirely in the spirit which that extraordinary enterprise had generated. The contested supremacy was for many years conceived to be represented by the possession of Italy ; and the innumerable permutations of alliances which had been witnessed in the wars referred to, suggested all the requisite ideas of State-combinations. Whether it can be strictly said that, in these early transactions, regard was really had to that equitable adjustment of power which became, subsequently, the avowed object of similar struggles, may be reasonably doubted ; but, at all events, European States now first began to group themselves about two centres ; and both parties anxiously cast about for means of circumscribing the resources of their adversary or enlarging their own. It was no more than a natural result of such a condition of things, that the causes which had hitherto operated in promoting hostilities or friendship between States, should be superseded by more absorbing considerations of present policy ; and it will be seen, accordingly, that though religious differences were still capable of originating wars, yet no material obstacle was found in diversity of creeds to the establishment of cordial and permanent alliances. In the Thirty Years' War, for instance, though the dispute lay ostensibly between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant constituencies of the Empire, yet the paramount object of the aggressive belligerents was the depression of the House of Austria ; and in this good cause, the Popish troops of France, at the instigation of a cardinal minister, fought shoulder to shoulder with the particoloured Protestants of Germany and Sweden.

It was in such a state of affairs and opinion, that Francis I. turned his eyes towards the Porte. Solyman the Great, who in 1520 had ascended the Turkish throne, had again directed

the Ottoman arms to European conquests—and with a success surpassing the boldest achievements of his victorious predecessors. But these events, which a century before might have struck all Christian capitals with indignation and alarm, were now only looked upon as so many inducements to a political alliance. Francis saw in Solyman, not the conqueror of Rhodes and the would-be subjugator of Christendom, but the monarch of a mighty State availably situated for active diversion, and already at feud with his deadly enemy. That the Ottoman Sultan should have invested Vienna, and openly advanced pretensions to the supremacy claimed by Charles, were circumstances only additionally suggestive of the projected treaty. His resolution was taken accordingly. There had long been certain relations of trade and amity between French merchants and the Mameluke Soldans of Egypt; and when this country fell, as we have stated, under the dominion of the Turks, the privileges enjoyed by the Christian traffickers had been judiciously confirmed and augmented. These antecedents were turned to account by Francis; who based upon them a proposal for a general commercial treaty between France and the Porte.\* The instrument, it is true, did not stipulate any alliance for offence or defence; but the assurances of amity now ostentatiously interchanged, were sufficiently indicative of the point to which matters were tending; and within a few months, the corsair subjects of the Porte were actually let loose upon the Neapolitan possessions of the Catholic king!

Such was the first formal recognition of the Ottoman dynasty of Constantinople. Truces and treaties had, of course, been previously concluded between the Porte and its enemies; but this was the earliest instance of an amicable and gratuitous alliance; and it is worth observing, that so early did it occur, as to make the admission of a Mahometan Power into the community of Christian States contemporaneous with the very first and rudimentary combinations of these States among each other. That it was considered a step out of the common course of politics, and that it created, even in impartial quarters, some scandal, we can easily perceive; but not more, perhaps, than had been occasioned by the previous overtures of the same unscrupulous monarch to the Protestants of Smalcald. It is a significant indication too, of the temper of the times, that the treaty was negotiated at

---

\* What a benefit to History, if the National Press of other countries was as usefully employed as that of France, in publications resembling the one, which we have placed at the head of our present Article. Is nobody engaged upon a translation of Von Hammer's '*Ottoman Empire*'?

Constantinople by a knight of St. John—and that it contained a special provision for the admission of the Pope to the league!

Still, there was really, as we have said, some scandal; and it needed in fact a concurrence of conditions to bring about so strange an innovation as the political naturalisation of the Turk among the States of Christendom. Some of these conditions are in the highest degree curious and interesting. In the first place, since the period when we left the Ottomans on their way towards Egypt and Persia, the Reformation of religion in Europe had been successfully carried out. This mighty event exercised a twofold influence upon the relationship between the Christian Powers and the Papal See. On the one hand, by subtracting so many States from the supremacy of the Pope, and weakening, in direct proportion, his authoritative power, it dislocated and neutralised the influence of that particular court, from which all combinations against the misbelievers had previously received their warrant and organisation. No crusade could be maintained without the auspices of a Pope; and upon the good will and services of this potentate more urgent and impressive claims were now preferred. But a few years before, indeed, the Pontiff had been besieged and imprisoned in his own city,—not by the fierce Mahometans, who once threatened such an attack, and at the echo of whose arms on Italian territory a former pope had actually prepared to retreat beyond the Alps, but by the sworn foes of these intruders—the troops, on whose protection against such contingencies the powerless Romans had been heretofore taught to rely. The time had past when the most deadly antagonist of the Pope was necessarily the Turk, and with it had gone all opportunity for the moral or material organisation of an actual crusade. On the other hand, the support derivable for such purposes from popular opinion was diminished in a corresponding degree by the operation of the same events. A new object had been found for the combative propensities of fanaticism or zeal. In the religious wars of these times, ‘heretic’ was substituted for ‘infidel,’ and the enthusiasm or animosity which in former days might have been directed against the encroachments of the Turk, were now furnished with sufficient occupation by the fatal divisions of Christendom itself. These causes, co-operating with a visible and settled repugnance to distant crusades, with the distractions arising from domestic vicissitudes, and with the indifference to alarming phenomena which familiarity ultimately brings on, may be taken perhaps as explanatory of that course of events which at length not only established the House of Osman upon the throne of the Cæsars, but gave it a title and place in the courts and councils of Europe.



It was not, however, under any ordinary aspect that this diplomatic *début* was solemnised. The Ottoman Porte made its entry into the European system with all the appliances of glory, grandeur, and triumph. Not only was it a first-rate Power, but, excepting the yet scarcely manageable resources of Imperial Germany, it was the strongest Power which could take the field. This consciousness of strength, combined with that orthodox insolence and heritage of pretensions to which we have alluded, gave to its deportment the genuine impress of barbaric pride. The Emperor of the Ottomans carried himself as a sovereign immeasurably exalted above all the monarchs of the West—especially above those with whom he was brought into immediate contact. The view taken by Solymán of the overtures of Francis I. may be collected from his haughty boast, that in his shadow the kings of France, Poland, Venice, and Transylvania had been fain to seek refuge. The first Austrian ambassador despatched to the Sublime Porte, was sternly rebuked for applying a majestic epithet to his own master, and was thrown contemptuously into prison. Indeed, for a long subsequent period, the Oriental arrogance of Turkish sultans withheld from the representatives of foreign Powers those honourable immunities which in the intercourse of civilised nations is ever attached to their office; and the personal liberties of the diplomatic body in the vicinity of the Seven Towers were proverbially insecure. Meanwhile, it is affirmed, by no less competent authority than that of Azuni, that on general international questions, Turkey has at all times set an example of moderation to the more civilised governments of Europe. Sketching, now, a broad outline of the position of Turkey between this time and a period which we may fix at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War, we might say that the idea of the 'Infidels' had, from various causes, virtually disappeared; and that if the Porte was on other than acceptable terms with the courts of Christendom, the difference was not owing to its national faith. By the States engaged in hostilities with it, it was regarded as neither more nor less than an ordinary enemy; nor would we undertake to prove that Hungary\* had much greater repugnance to a Turkish than to an Austrian master. The States removed from occasions of collision with the Porte were positively amicable—submitting to certain barbaric assumptions in consideration of commercial advantages. France had led the way from motives already explained; Venice, which in mercantile compacts had been already in the field, promptly followed; and England's first am-

---

\* Ed. Rev. vol. i. p. 454-5.

bassador departed from the court of Elizabeth. His reception, curiously enough, was not unopposed. Previously, our few negotiations with the Porte had been transacted through the representatives of the States already accredited there; and neither Venice nor France was disposed to forego the prerogative of mediation, or to welcome a new competitor on the scene. The objections, however, were overruled, and the Ottoman Porte was declared open to all. In 1606 the United States despatched also their envoy to Constantinople: And thus, either the suggestions of policy, or the temptations of trade, had collected the representatives of Christendom about the Turkish Sultan, at as early a period as could be reasonably anticipated from the temper of the government, and the distance of the scene.

The influence directly exerted at this period by Turkey upon Western Europe was not, indeed, remarkable; though there are two points connected with it which deserve to be recorded. The incessant attacks of the Ottomans along the Danube and the Theiss, created in Germany such a sense of insecurity as had not been felt since the irruptions of the Moguls; and it became indeed evident that the protection of the Empire under such new frontier relations could not be entrusted to a distant or non-resident sovereign. It was true that the front recently shown by Charles V. to Solymán proved that the armies of the East could be over-matched, on emergencies, by the forces of the West; but these forces could be mustered only by such desperate appeals, and after such difficulties, that they supplied but an uncertain resource against the perils constantly impending from the ambition or ferocity of the Sultan. Even on the occasion alluded to, the Mahometans were in the very heart of Styria, before the strength of the Empire could be collected for the deliverance of Germany. These obvious considerations, though they had less weight than might have been anticipated with the Imperial States, who apprehended more danger to their liberties from the House of Hapsburgh than from the House of Othman, did induce Charles so far to modify his own schemes as to partition the reversion of his possessions, and to bespeak the Imperial crown for his brother Ferdinand, instead of his son Philip. His exertions secured a settlement which he afterwards vainly tried to cancel. Ferdinand was elected King of the Romans; and thus the substitution of the formidable Ottoman for the degenerate Greek in the halls of Constantinople, was the means of settling the crown of the Empire in a German instead of a Spanish House—and of laying the broad foundation of the great monarchy of Austria. The event, too, produced its reaction on the fortunes of Turkey; for Ferdinand,

this strengthened, succeeded in incorporating the elective crown of Hungary with the already aggrandised inheritance of his family. From this consolidation of dominion flowed two results of signal importance to the subject we are now considering. Not only was a State created of sufficient magnitude to resist the aggressions of the Turk, but this rival empire became actually *conterminous* with the Ottoman dominions. Prague, Buda, and Vienna were now capitals of the same kingdom; a blow struck at Zeuta was felt at Frankfort; and thus, instead of the uncertain resistance dictated by the fitful and erratic impulses of Hungarian cavaliers, a steady force was organised and arrayed against the Turk, and the majesty and strength of Imperial Christendom was brought bodily on his borders.

It is with no wish to disparage the national character of Hungary that we here acknowledge our doubts whether this kingdom of itself either served or could have served as that 'bulwark of Christendom' which it has been often denominated. We think, indeed, that after an impartial review of the annals of this period, it will be difficult to escape the conclusion that, but for its practical identification with the Germanic Empire, it would probably have become, and perhaps have remained, a dependency of the misbelievers. Even as it was, it should be remembered that Buda was Turkish for almost as long a period as Gibraltar has been English; while, as regards any active or inveterate antagonism on the score of religion, we find little ground for concluding that the inhabitants of Hungary would have shown more tenacity than the population of Wallachia or Moldavia. The personal prowess and brilliant successes of Hunniades and Matthias Corvinus were mainly instrumental, no doubt, in stemming the first torrent of Ottoman conquest; but though the flower of the armies which encountered the Moslem on the Danube, were usually supplied from the chivalry of Hungary, it is impossible not to trace the ultimate transfer of ascendancy, to those events which established a mutual assurance among all the kingdoms between the Vistula and the Rhine.

The second of the points to which we alluded as notably exemplifying the influence of Turkey upon Christendom was the establishment, on the coast of Barbary, of those anomalous piratical States which have only within our own generation become extinct. From the earliest development of their national strength, the Turks have always experienced and confessed their inferiority on the seas; and though their unexpected victory over the Venetians at Sapienza for a moment might appear to announce a change, yet the improvement was not maintained; and

the famous battle of Lepanto decided the capacity of the Turkish marine. Exasperated, however, at the insults to which he was exposed, and desirous of creating by any methods some counterpoise to the supremacy of the European Powers in the Mediterranean, Solymán the Great invested the celebrated Barbarossa with a title beyond the mere fact of conquest, to the possessions he had already acquired on the African coast. Algiers and its kindred strongholds became feudatories of the Porte; and in this capacity supplied, as will be remembered, the materials for some of the most curious historical episodes of the times in question. To say that these predatory governments ever seriously influenced the affairs of Europe would be attributing to them too great importance; but before the rise and growth of the proper Powers Maritime, they often successfully contested the command of the adjacent waters. It might have been reasonably expected that they would have been outlawed by the very fact of the profession which they so audaciously carried on. Instead of this, treaties were entered into with them by too many States to allow of their being proceeded against as pirates; so that the favour of the Porte had little difficulty in maintaining them for three centuries in their anomalous existence. Something, perhaps, they owed to the reciprocal jealousies of Christian States; and it deserves at least to be mentioned, that our own good understanding with these piratical communities preceded even our definite alliance with Holland, and was disturbed by only a single serious rupture through a century and a half.

Our review has now reached a point at which the action of the Ottoman Empire upon the affairs of Christendom can no longer be described as peculiarly that of a Mahometan Power. The holy war against Christians no longer supplied any guiding principle of Turkish policy, nor was any combination likely to be suggested by analogous considerations on the other side. When Mahomet III. departed from Constantinople on his campaign against the Emperor Rodolf II., his martial pomp was swelled by the ambassadors of France and England. And in truth, at the opening of the seventeenth century, the principal European States were either at peace with the Porte, or had contracted positive alliances with it. The idea of attaching to it any political disabilities on the score of religion, had in reality become extinct, though it still survived in popular conceptions and received occasional illustrations in examples of individual chivalry. In fact, the existence of the still powerful order of St. John, holding its possessions and privileges on the recorded condition of war with the infidel, was sufficient to perpetuate the traditions of a previous period; and instances of volunteers

in the same cause were of constant recurrence. The spirit of which we are speaking was conspicuously exemplified at the famous siege of Candia, when, in addition to other succours, the garrison was reinforced by a select band of Christian knights under the Duc de Beaufort, although the alliance between France and the Porte remained nominally undisturbed. 'The French,' said the vizier Kiuperli on this occasion, 'are our friends;—but we usually find them with our enemies.' No serious notice, however, was taken of these incidents; nor was there wanting at Constantinople an accurate appreciation of the subsisting policy of the principal cabinets of Europe. In the reign of our Charles I., a Venetian envoy ventured to threaten the Porte with a Christian league. 'The Pope,' returned the Turkish minister, 'would sting if he could, but he has lost the power; Spain and Germany have their own work upon their hands; the interests of France are ours; while, as to England and Holland, they would only be too glad to supersede you in the commercial privileges you enjoy. Declare your war then,—and see how you will fare for allies.' This estimate of the condition and temper of contemporary governments was tolerably correct, and, indeed, a combination of motives frequently secured to the Porte diplomatic concessions, not yielded to any Christian Power. Nor was its character in its public relations wholly that of a barbarian State. It was unquestionably chargeable with ignorant vanity, with passionate caprice, with savage cruelty, and with a contemptuous disregard of international usages; but, on the other hand, it often displayed a magnanimous disdain of opportunities, and a noble sympathy for greatness in misfortune; while its ordinary respect for such treaty engagements as it had formally contracted, was at least on a level with that of other governments, from whose civilisation and religion more might have been expected.

The truth is, that at this period the peculiar character of the Turkish State was manifested rather in its neutrality than its aggressiveness. Bacon's doctrine that there was a perpetual justification of invasive war with the Turks, on the ground of prevention, was evidently an anachronism. Probably no Christian Power, in such a position, could have avoided an active participation in the wars of religion and succession which one after another desolated the European Continent; whereas the arms of Turkey, at this crisis of the destinies of Germany, were again turned with irresistible force upon Persia. It was not until that terrible struggle had been terminated, that the Ottomans were allured, by the seductive representations of Tekeli, to make their last gratuitous demonstrations against the capital of the Western Empire. But the result of

this famous invasion was very different from what they had anticipated. Not only were the ramparts of Vienna maintained against Black Mustapha's janizaries, and his spahis scattered by the first charge of Sobieski's cavaliers, but the several particulars of the campaign disclosed the fact, that the preeminence in arms had passed at length from the Ottomans to the Christians. The stories of this celebrated siege, and the apparent peril of a second Christian capital, tended to revive in no small degree the popular horror of the Turk; however, in point of fact, the growing ascendancy of Christendom had been indisputably shown. Already had the defence of Candia, protracted to more than twice the length of the defence of Troy, demonstrated the resources of even unorganised Europe against the whole forces of the Ottoman Empire, directed by the ablest minister it had ever known; the recollections of Lepanto were reanimated and heightened by a new series of naval victories; and now, for the first time, the superior excellence of European tactics was displayed on the banks of the Danube. Even had Vienna yielded to the first assaults, there is scarcely any room for doubting that the tide of conquest must soon have been both stayed and turned.

Still, although the seventeenth century was to close upon the Porte with humiliation and discomfiture, neither its attitude nor its position among the States of Europe had yet experienced any material change. It no longer indeed maintained a mastery in the field; but it still preserved its traditional carriage in the cabinet. It was still beyond obvious reach of insult or attack, and still affected the haughty language of unapproachable supremacy. It had not yet come to need countenance or protection; nor was the Power at present in being before whose deadly antagonism its fortunes were at length to fail. A step, however, had about this time been taken towards the impending change, which deserves to be recorded. The Turks were disqualified no less by individual character than by national pretensions for the subtle functions of diplomacy; and the rude violence of their deportment in their foreign relations may be ascribed in no inconsiderable degree to the fierce and obstinate bearing of a true believer. Towards the end of the century, accidental events suggested the employment, in this peculiar capacity of the Grecian subjects of the Porte; who turned to such account the opportunities which were thus afforded them, that they presently monopolised the more important duties of external intercourse. In some sense, the Ottoman Empire was of course a gainer by the substitution of these supple intriguers for its own intractable sons; but the change contributed materially to affect its position in the eyes of other nations, and served incidentally to mark the period at which its characteristic arrogance began to recede.

With the eighteenth century a new scene opened upon Europe, in which the part hitherto played by Turkey was to be strangely reversed. Though we have brought our sketch of the Ottoman fortunes to a comparatively modern period, we have as yet had no opportunity of naming that remarkable nation by whose action they were to be finally regulated. The reader may, perhaps, be amused with the first dim foreshadowing of the mighty figures which were to come. In times long past, before the singular succession of bold and sagacious monarchs on the throne of Constantinople had been broken by the elevation of idiots or debauchees from the recesses of the seraglio, some of these powerful princes, with an enlightenment for which they have hardly received sufficient credit, cast about for means of restoring those commercial advantages of which their dominions had been deprived by the discoveries of Vasco di Gama, and by the consequent diversion of Eastern trade from the overland route to an entirely new channel. Among other projects for this purpose, Selim II. conceived or revived the idea of connecting by an artificial canal, at the most convenient points, the two great streams of the Don and the Volga, thus opening a navigable passage from the Black Sea to the Caspian, and establishing an easy communication between Central Asia and Western Europe. It was seldom that the Ottoman Sultans did their work negligently. On this occasion the zeal of Selim was quickened by his desire to invade Persia through the new route, and he commenced his canal as it might have been commenced by a king of Egypt. He may be pardoned, in the fulness of his power, for not taking into account the destined opposition to his schemes. As the work, however, was proceeding, a body of men, with uncouth figures, strange features, and barbarous language, sallied out from a neighbouring town, surprised the expedition, and cut soldiers and workmen to pieces. These savages were the Muscovite subjects of Ivan the Terrible, — and such was the first encounter of *the Turks and the Russians*.

About the middle of the ninth century, a short time before the accession of our Alfred the Great, Rurik, one of the Varangian rovers of the Baltic, sailed into the Gulf of Finland, and, with the audacity and fortune characteristic of his race, established a Norman dynasty at Novogorod. He presently despatched a step-son to secure the city of Kiev, on the Dnieper, which had formed the southern settlements of the old Slavish population, as Novogorod had formed the northern; and the invaders thus became the recognised lords of a country which was even then called Russia. To the instincts of the

new settlers, the wealthy and unwarlike empire of the East was a point of irresistible attraction, and five times within a century were the 'Russians' conducted by their new rulers to the siege of Constantinople. The bulwarks, however, of the imperial city were proof against the canoes and spears of the barbarians; and the last of these expeditions, in 955, terminated in an event which precluded any recurrence of the trial. By the instrumentality of a princess, the House of Rurik and its subjects received the doctrines of Christianity; and from this time the marauding ambition of the Russians was exchanged for a deep respect towards that State from which they had obtained their religion, their written characters, and many of the usages of civilisation. Unfortunately, one of the consequences of the disorders of an irregular and disputed succession was the transfer, about the year 1170, of the seat of government from Kiev to Vladimir. The former city had been early preferred to Novogorod, on account of its contiguity to the scene of anticipated conquest; and, when the relations between its rulers and the Greek emperors had experienced the change to which we have referred, the proximity was still desirable, for the sake of an intercourse which was exercising a highly beneficial though partial influence upon the rising kingdom. But this removal of the 'grand 'princes' or 'dukes' from so convenient a capital as Kiev, to what is nearly the centre of the present monarchy, completely cut off the Russians from Constantinople and Christendom; and was the first of those occurrences which so singularly retarded the political development of this mighty State. The second was the invasion of the Moguls.

When, in the middle of the thirteenth century, the Tartars of the Asiatic Highlands burst, for the third time, upon the plains of Europe, they found an easy prey in the disorganised principalities of Russia. Vladimir, as we have remarked, was the capital of a grand duchy, to which a score of princes, all of the blood of Rurik, owed a nominal allegiance; but, so destructive had been the consequences of unsettled successions and repeated partitions, that there was nothing to oppose the inroad or settlement of the Mogul; and the result was the establishment, upon the banks of the Don, of a Tartar khannat, with undisputed supremacy over the ancient princes of the land. The sovereignty of the horde, however, although complete, was not very actively exerted; and, in the two centuries which followed, the grand dukes were left at liberty to work out, in the interior of the country, the problem of Russian liberation. Kiev having now been definitely abandoned, the seats of the three leading princes were at Vladimir,



Twer, and Moscow; the first of which lines enjoyed the supremacy, until it devolved, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, upon Twer, and, in the course of about fifty years more, upon Moscow. At this point the succession was finally settled in the person of Ivan of Moscow, surnamed Kalita; whose resources were strengthened by the gradual conflux of the population upon his territory, as they retired from the encroachments of the Lithuanians and Poles. His descendants were soon enabled to hold their own not only against these nations, but even against their Tartar lords; and the frame of a kingdom of 'Muscovy' was already formed, when, in 1462, IVAN THE GREAT succeeded to the heritage of his ancestors. So completely, indeed, had the collateral lines of the royal stock been subordinated to its head, that little more was required for the consolidation of a powerful monarchy than the reduction of some municipal republics, and the subjugation of the now enfeebled horde on the Don. These conditions were soon realised. In 1481 Ivan, assuming the title of Czar, announced himself as an independent sovereign to the States of Christendom;—and the EMPIRE OF RUSSIA was formed.

It is very remarkable that even this remote and peculiar State, which then gave so little promise of its future destiny, should thus have been apparently consolidated at the same period which witnessed the definite formation of so many of the European kingdoms. Ivan the Great was contemporary with Maximilian of Austria, with Ferdinand of Spain, and with Louis XI. of France. And circumstances, arising immediately from the events before us, seemed at one moment to favour, in no small degree, the ultimate development of the new dominion. Constantinople, the early patroness of Russian progress and civilisation, from which the recollections of the people had never, even by the intruding Tartars, been wholly estranged, had now, in her original capacity and influence, become extinct, and was occupied by aliens in religion and race. We may perhaps say, indeed, that this catastrophe was more sincerely felt in Russia than in any other part of Christendom. To the high gratification of his subjects, Ivan raised Sophia, the last of the Greek princesses, to a share of his throne and bed; adopted as the ensign of his State the two-headed eagle, which, by a strange vicissitude, had now been replaced at Constantinople by the old crescent of Pagan Byzantium; and appeared, by his alliance and his sympathies, to have acquired some of the dignity and pretensions of the emperors of the Greeks. Detached, in this manner, from its original connexion with the East, the Russian monarchy

acquired rather a European than an Asiatic aspect; an exchange undoubtedly conducive to its eventual advancement. Its penance, however, was not yet done. At this critical juncture, when every thing appeared to promise the speedy growth of the new Power, the old stock of Rurik, after seven centuries and a half of existence, failed in the third generation from the great Ivan; and a succession of usurpers, invaders, and pretenders for fifteen years, during which interregnum the country narrowly escaped annexation to Poland, threw back the rising monarchy into a condition scarcely better than that from which it had emerged. At length, in 1613, the election of Michael Romanoff to the vacant throne provided Russia anew with a royal stock; and the fated antagonist of the House of Othman was finally established in policy and power.

But for the retarding circumstances to which we have referred, it is probable that the relations between Turkey and Christendom would have been changed at a much earlier period by the menacing attitude of Russian dominion. Alexis, the second of the Romanoffs, suggested, even in the middle of the seventeenth century, the formation of a holy league against the infidels of Constantinople. His country, however, was as yet in no condition to play the part desired; nor was it, indeed, until the days of Peter the Great, that Russian vessels, after a lapse of nearly eight centuries, again swam the sea of Azov. Still, the future was preparing. The peace of Carlowitz, in 1699, terminated the last of those Turkish wars by which European freedom was conceived to be threatened. It actually included Russia: and thus was Russia, for the first time, brought seriously into hostile contact with the Porte. It may be even added, that the terms of the treaty were honourable to Peter; nevertheless, although the ascendancy of the Imperialist over the Ottoman arms had now been conclusively decided, some time further was to elapse before this superiority was shared by Russia also.

The Turkish Empire entered upon the eighteenth century, considerably damaged by the last campaigns. Its forces had been relatively, though not, perhaps, actually weakened; but its reputation was most seriously diminished. Nevertheless, this very circumstance probably contributed, by finally removing all dread of its aggressions, to promote that peculiar interest which the cabinets of Europe now began to take in its political fortunes. It was, however, the progress of Russia alone which modified the estimation of Turkey among the Western States; and we shall best understand this gradual revolution of opinion by observing the respective positions of the Porte and its new rival, at the close of the several wars by which this century was distin-

guished. It should be recollected, that the direct influence of Turkey, at this period, upon the European system, was almost exclusively confined to the Northern States. The secret inspiration of France was, indeed, perceptible in the decisions of the Divan; but it was only on the banks of the Vistula and the shores of the Baltic that the vibrations of Ottoman struggles were practically felt. Acting on Russia and Poland through the medium of Cossack and Tartar hordes, which carried their allegiance and their disorder to all these countries in turn,—on Prussia and Sweden through Poland, and on Denmark through Russia,—the Turkish Empire found itself connected with the less important moiety of Christendom—its relations with the Great Powers of the West being mainly suggested by its capacities for annoying Austria. In the wars, therefore, of the Spanish succession, as in the other great European contests, the Ottoman Empire was in no ways directly mixed. Though its councils, as we shall presently see, became more and more exposed to the intrigues of diplomatists, yet so lordly was the indifference of the Porte to such opportunities, and so capricious and uncertain was its disposition, that no extensive combination could be safely based on its probable demeanour.

When the division of Europe with which it was most immediately concerned had been convulsed by the enterprises of Charles XII. of Sweden, it took no original part in the quarrel; but when, after the defeat of Pultawa, the vanquished hero sought refuge at Bender, the peace of Carlowitz was summarily broken, in behalf of a sovereign whose inferiority to his adversary had been exposed before all the world. It would be a work of some interest to ascertain how far the Divan was actually influenced by any considerations respecting Russian aggrandisement, and whether, upon this early occasion, its deliberations were swayed by the maxims of more modern policy. That it was not so influenced, to any very great extent, we may perhaps infer from its promptitude in engaging the Czar, and from the justification which such confidence received on the Pruth. Peter was there completely discomfited; and although the Swedish king gained nothing in the end, the advantages obtained by the Turks over the Russians appeared in 1711 quite decisive on the comparative strength of the two parties. In 1724, however, the Divan had begun to look with jealousy, if not apprehension, upon the growth of Russia; and war was only averted by the good offices of the French court. Its ambassador, on this occasion, represented to the Porte, remarkably enough, that the aggrandisement of Russia could be in no wise injurious to the Ottoman interests; but that, on the contrary, it

would supply a counterpoise against Austria, the natural enemy of Mahometan power.\* It is said, that Peter the Great bequeathed certain cabinet traditions for effacing what he considered to be the humiliating features of the treaty of the Pruth; and it is at any rate clear, that when the accession of the Empress Anne introduced fresh spirit into the Russian counsels, an opportunity was promptly found to renew hostilities with the Ottomans. Indeed, the cabinet of St. Petersburg appears to have even now almost succeeded to the imperious carriage of the Porte itself. Though, twenty years later, such was the condition of the country, that one of the most intelligent of French diplomatists described it as a country liable, at any moment, to relapse into barbarism, and on that ground disqualified for any permanent alliances; yet it already assumed all the airs of supremacy, so far as even to contest the ancient precedence of France. The war from 1735 to 1739, which now ensued, proved the hinging point in the military fortunes of Turkey. It cannot certainly be termed discreditable in its conduct. Since, notwithstanding that it was actually engaged in Persia with the formidable Nadir Shah, the Porte was still able to show a resolute front to Munnich in the Crimea, and to the Count de Wallis on the Danube, and at length drove the Austrians to a precipitate peace under the walls of Belgrade. But though the honour of the Ottoman arms was thus far unexpectedly maintained, and though no advantage was ever gained against them without a desperate struggle, it was nevertheless demonstrated, by the results of the campaign, that the rising power of Russia had at length reached an equality with that of Turkey; nor could it be much longer doubtful with which the superiority would rest for the future. The point had now been reached after which, even if Turkey did not retrograde, yet Russia must continue to advance, — and the distance between them must yearly increase. Even the terms of the particular treaty which followed immediately upon the peace of Belgrade, showed the change of relationship between them. The territorial arrangements were not greatly to the disadvantage of the Porte; but the haughty Ottoman condescended to acknowledge an 'Empress' in the Czarina; and an explicit stipulation was introduced for the annulment of all previous conventions, agreements, and concessions, and the recognition of this treaty as solely defining the relations which were to subsist thereafter between the contracting Powers.

After this, all, excepting the actual conquest of the Ottoman Empire, may be said to be virtually over. In fact, even the

last war had been commenced with the definite expectation of despoiling the Porte of some, at least, of its European possessions, — so precipitate had been its decline. Turkey was now fairly on the descending limb of her orbit; and it seemed easy to calculate the speed with which she was hastening to her setting. True to her ancient policy, if such a term can be applied to a strange combination of ignorance, highmindedness, and disdain, the Porte took no part in the wars which embroiled its old antagonists at the demise, in 1740, of the Imperial Crown; or in the seven years' hostilities which afterwards ensued. On the contrary, it actually proffered its disinterested mediation to the belligerents, and voluntarily despatched to the Court of Vienna assurances of its unaltered amity. The question on which peace was at last broken, was that of expiring Poland. To say that the Divan was mainly influenced in this movement by sentiments of sympathy or generosity would be saying too much; but, so blind was it to the changes which time had wrought in the relative strength of the parties, that, in 1768, it deliberately and of its own accord declared war upon Russia. The campaigns which followed, speedily demonstrated the fatal folly of such a proceeding. The position of Turkey had, for nearly half a century, been defensive, and its vulnerable points were now fully exposed. On the other hand, so steady and rapid had been the advance, in the last thirty years, of Russian power, that the germs of all its subsequent pretensions were already visible, with their consequences, in this, the first war after the peace of Belgrade. Russian squadrons immediately scoured the Archipelago; Russian missionaries excited the Greek subjects of the Porte to rebellion; Russian agents tampered with the refractory governors of Egypt. So settled was the confidence of Catharine II. in the superiority of her admirably disciplined troops, that the vast hosts of the Ottomans were deliberately met by one eighth of their numbers, — and with perfect success. The Turks were driven out of Wallachia and Moldavia; the Danube was crossed; the fortresses of its southern bank invested; and the Ottoman communications intercepted between the famous camp of Schumla and its magazines at Varna.

And now, for the first time, were the general apprehensions of Christendom excited, *on behalf of the Turks!* Austria, though both previously and subsequently allured by a proposal for sharing the expected spoils, discerned a new danger and a new policy, while England and France acquired new motives of interest; and even Prussia acknowledged her concern. What adds to the significance of this agitation is, that it was of no avail. Catharine proudly rejected all intervention; and, at her

own time and upon her own terms, dictated the treaty of Kainardgi, which carried the old frontier of Peter the Great on to the banks of the Bug.

This was the first advancement of the boundaries of Russia to the south: and we may convey an intelligible idea of the system commenced, on this occasion, by merely enumerating the stages of its progress from those days to the present. Between the channels of the Dnieper and the Danube, three smaller streams fall in parallel directions into the waters of the Euxine—the Bug, the Dniester, and the Pruth. In the time of Peter, the Russian frontier had been formed by the Dnieper; in 1774, it was carried, as we have said, to the Bug; in 1792 to the Dniester; in 1812 to the Pruth; and in 1829, the line was made to include the mouths of the Danube. These advances represent, of course, grave contests and serious cost. In 1784, Catharine had so far ventured on the rights of the strongest, as to annex the Crimea to her dominion, by the simple authority of an imperial ukase. But by her menacing parades in these regions, and by her haughty inscription—‘the route to Byzantium’—over one of the gates of Kherson, she at length exasperated the still ferocious Ottomans beyond the bounds of patience,—and war was again declared by the Porte. The campaigns of Potemkin and Suwarrow—the capture of Oczakoff—and the storm of Ismail, followed. The results we have already named.

What we are now, however, desirous of noticing, is not so much the protracted struggle between Turkish desperation and Russian strength, as the political persuasions which the development of these facts contributed to generate in Europe. We drew attention at an early stage of our remarks, to the influence originally sought for, though with great submissiveness and timidity, by the emissaries of France at the court of the Sultan. There was, we may here observe, a singular convenience in the alliance to which the Porte had been thus incidentally led. The King of France was far enough removed to be beyond the risk of collision; the traditional connexion of his cabinet with the affairs of Poland, and its peculiar authority with the Order of St. John gave him frequent opportunities of serviceable mediation, while his position, as the first hereditary monarch of the Christian world, was such as to gratify the inordinate pride of the Ottoman Sultans. In respect of arrogance, however, the French monarchs were nearly a match for their Oriental allies. They exacted from the Porte the title of ‘*Padischah*,’ or Emperor; and, in the conduct of such of their ambassadors as *Marcheville* and *Ferriol*, it is difficult to trace much superiority over the uncivilised envoys of the Porte. But as the preponderance

of the Ottoman power gradually decreased, this indefinite influence of France assumed a more positive form and scope, and at length, in the wars of Louis le Grand, it was visibly established. So ambitious a monarch could not overlook a Power of which so much use was to be made in a variety of ways. The Most Christian King had been forced indeed, for very decency, to despatch certain succours to the Emperor at the moment when the infidel was actually menacing Vienna: But his agents were all the while busy at Constantinople; and in the delay of the pacification with which at length the war and the century were terminated, the interested action of a Western Power was, for the first time, notoriously traceable. After this period, the necessities or liabilities of the Ottoman State in this respect, became matter of common recognition; and so regularly during the next hundred years did all the great Powers of Europe, according to their successive ascendancies or opportunities, claim a right of interference and mediation in the negotiations and treaties of the Porte, that the conduct of Catharine II. in disallowing such intervention between her and her enemy, was conceived to indicate an extraordinary degree of presumption. These intercessions, however, had not yet been dictated or determined by any general alarm at the aggrandisement of Russia; they originated in the prospect of advantage which each State discerned in communicating the impress of its own interests to the engagements of a nation dissociated by creed, position, and character from the ordinary politics of Christendom. Even after Turkey ceased to be an aggressive Power, it still retained the capacity of effecting, on emergencies, most serious diversions, — and of granting commercial privileges of no trifling value. It became in fact a State, which, though not secluded from the rights of political community, was yet so practically withdrawn from the sphere of ordinary combinations, as to appear like a ready-made instrument for all collateral purposes. Its disdainful chivalry and its passionate caprices were well known; nor was there any cabinet of importance which did not appreciate the possible services they might confer. At the Pruth, the mediating Powers were England and Poland; at Belgrade, the mission devolved upon France. Prussia was characteristically introduced to the Divan by the admiration of the Ottoman for the personal qualities of the Great Frederic. The state of things disclosed by Romanzoff's campaigns, transformed even Austria into an intercessor on behalf of the Turks; and in 1792 the cabinets of London and Berlin found themselves zealously co-operating for the same end. Other scenes, however, were now at hand.

The position of Turkey at the opening of those eventful

days which changed the face of Europe by and through the French Revolution, was briefly this:— She had escaped the imminency of peril. The last wars had conclusively established both the gigantic strength of Russia and the uses to which it would probably be applied. Catharine did not condescend to disguise her ambition or her hopes. She openly discussed the project of restoring a Greek Empire at Constantinople for the benefit of her successors; and revived the auspicious name of Constantine in a prince of her royal house. Nor, although the fate of Poland had alarmed the statesmen of Europe, was it by any means certain that any peremptory arbitration could at this time have been interposed between Russia and her prey. In 1791, Pitt had found himself totally unsupported in his proposition to equip a squadron of observation for the Dardanelles; the functions of France, the old and, nominally at least, the natural ally of the Porte, were entirely suspended; and the complicity and spoils of Polish dismemberment furnished the Northern Courts with irresistible arguments and temptations. Already, in fact, had the *partition* of Turkey been deliberately canvassed, as a preferable alternative to its absorption; and although subsequent events showed that the Ottomans were by no means so defenceless as they were presumed to be, yet it may be doubted whether they would not have been thrown wholly for support at this time on their own fanatical courage. Even ten years earlier, France, acting always as the confidential friend of Turkey, had intimated to the Divan, that in any future war it would probably be vain to look to Europe for diversion or aid; and the inclinations of Austria to participate rather in the plunder than in the prevention of the deed were sufficiently known. From these hazards, however, the Porte was now relieved. The Governments of Europe were fain to pause in their traditional careers; and the same circumstances which had exempted the Ottoman Empire from any share in the great wars of the century just expiring, secured it also in a similar immunity from the revolutionary tempests by which a new order of things was ushered in. At length, after six years' neutrality, the passions of the Porte were violently roused by the ambition of the Directory. The ancient interests of France in these regions of the world were characteristically symbolised in her revolutionary counsels, by a descent upon Egypt! The results of this famous expedition were, in many points of view, remarkable; and in none more than those immediately connected with the subject under review. Unable to comprehend either the Revolution or its consequences, the Porte could at least discern that its oldest ally was deliberately proposing to rob it



of its fairest province. It accordingly declared war against France; and, as a natural sequel of such a determination, drew more and more closely to Great Britain, which, always favourably disposed towards Turkey, had now become its most obvious counsellor and friend. Into the particulars of the engagements which followed, we need not enter. It will be enough to observe, that by this measure the French Government rudely snapped asunder an alliance of two centuries and a half; that the protectorate thus lost, passed virtually to England; and that the ultimate effects of the enterprise threatened little less than the transfer to this country of the credit, influence, and privileges, which France, for so long a period, had enjoyed in the dominions of the Porte.

The new impulse, however, thus communicated to the policy of the Divan was by no means undisturbed. The vicissitudes of the great war soon furnished so adroit a negotiator as Napoleon with opportunities of reviving or remodelling the alliances of the old monarchy; and so well were his intrigues seconded by the impolicy of our own proceedings that, in 1807, the Dardanelles were forced by an English fleet while the defence of Constantinople was directed by a minister of France. The publication of the secret compact between Alexander and Napoleon at Tilsit once more, and more conclusively, estranged the Porte from its French connexions; and at length, by a concerted pacification between Turkey and Russia in 1812, the forces of the latter Power were opportunely disengaged to assist towards the issue of the Moscow campaign. We touch but cursorily on these events, since, however momentous in themselves, they but indirectly affected the question before us. What is chiefly to be remarked is, that Turkey, during this period, was received with more universal consent, and on a more legitimate footing than before, into the community of European States, and that the part assigned to her in their general federative policy partook more of a regular character. On the other hand, although certain obligations were in this way contracted towards the Porte by the European States, yet its fated antagonist was more than proportionately strengthened by the operation of the same causes. So conspicuous and substantial had been the services of Russia in the struggle of Europe against Napoleon, and so entirely was the Continental policy of the Court of St. Petersburg now identified with that of the other great Powers, that the attitude of the Czar became far more formidable than before; and results which we need scarcely recapitulate, proved what substantial grounds there were for the growing apprehensions of the Divan.

What is called, indeed, 'the Eastern Question,' may be said to have been fully constituted at the close of the war. The opinion still survived, and, in fact, since the days of Catherine II., seemed gradually to have been confirmed, that the national existence of Turkey had reached its appointed term, and could only be protracted by the artificial suspense which the jealousies of Europe might combine to create. An element too of singular importance in the question now made itself visible. An interest was claimed, whether sincerely or otherwise, yet with great plausibility, by the Christian Powers of Europe in the Christian subjects of the Porte; and as these were mostly members of the Greek church, the sympathies and pretensions of Russia naturally assumed a peculiar prominence. The liberation of Greece and the incidents, whether of argument or violence, attending its accomplishment, furnish a sufficient exemplification of the views and considerations which were thus introduced upon the political stage, and which, it is evident, have ever since been steadily increasing in significance and weight. Still, a strong counterpoise remained in the conviction felt by all European cabinets but one, that the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, in its substantial integrity, was necessary to the prospective peace of Europe; and although this sentiment might, in some quarters, be reducible into a simple objection to a monopoly of the spoil, yet the difficulties of a partition were so great that, eventually, all parties coincided in a resolution to stave off the crisis, and postpone a question which they were unable to solve—with any satisfaction to themselves.

Such then is the position of the Ottoman Empire. Prostrate, to all appearance, at the feet of its vigilant and redoubtable foe, it is maintained, in a precarious security, by the jealousies rather than the sympathies of surrounding nations: For, although on more than one occasion, it has exhibited an unlooked-for vitality in the hour of peril, yet the experience of recent years forbids all further reliance on such resources. The Danube and the Balkan are no longer barriers. Adrianople has been already once reached; and between that city to Constantinople there intervenes but a step.

Historians have frequently indulged in speculations upon the causes of this decline. But the question lies, we think, within narrow limits. It is less the decay of one of the antagonists, than the growth of the other, which has so disturbed the balance between them. The armies which were overthrown by the Bajazets and the Amuraths bore no comparison to those encountered by Mahmood; nor is it probable that the Great Solymán, in the height of his power, could have ever made head against such a force as that now wielded by the reigning Czar. Turkey, in

short, has been stationary, while other nations have advanced. This is one of the consequences due mainly to the character of the national religion; though it would be incorrect to attribute to this most important influence results exclusively prejudicial. It is true that fanaticism has produced social insecurity as well as political stagnation, and that the false prophets of Ottoman history have been more numerous and successful than the pretenders or usurpers of any other history whatever. But, on the other hand, the sanctity which the theocratic principle communicated to the reigning House has proved its inviolable safeguard in the crisis of revolution; and the reversion of the holy Kalifate which Selim I. secured from the last phantom representative of the Abbasides conveyed no insignificant authority to the Commander of the Faithful. In virtue of this title, the supremacy of the Sublime Porte was recognised by all the orthodox Musliman world; so that an appeal based upon the obligations involved in it was actually, in 1799, transmitted to Constantinople from Seringapatam.

It is a remarkable feature in the history of the Ottoman and Russian Empires, that the destinies of both should be matter of long-descended tradition and common acceptance in the minds of the people. Though the establishment of the Turks in Europe is now of such respectable antiquity that its fourth, and perhaps fated centenary draws nigh, and though their rights of dominion have acquired a title beyond that of mere prescription, yet the nation itself, as has been observed by an historian not often distinguished by such felicitous brevity of expression, is still only '*encamped*' on its conquests. They have never comported themselves, either politically or socially, as if they anticipated in Europe any continuing home. Ottoman legends relate how a belief arose, even in the very hour of conquest, that the banner of the Cross would again be some day carried to the brink of the Straits; and it is said that this misgiving is traceable in the selection of the Asiatic shore for the final resting-place of true believers. It is certain, too, that from the first definite apparition of the Russian Empire, they instinctively recognised the antagonists of Fate. Europe had hardly learned the titles of the Czar, when the gaze of the Porte was uneasily directed to the new metropolis on the Neva; throughout the whole century, notwithstanding its chequered incidents, the impression was never weakened; and to this day the inhabitants of Constantinople point out the particular gate by which the Muscovite troops are to enter the City of Promise. Nor are the traditions less vivid on the other side. Although the visible ambition of the Imperial Court may have been generated by the creations of Peter and the con-

quests of Catharine, yet the impressions popularly current flow from an earlier and a less corrupted source. The ancient relations of Russia with the capital of the Cæsars, the early hostilities, the subsequent alliances, and the presumed inheritance of Ivan, are all matter of national legend; and combine, with the appeal to religion and the incitements of pride, to make the recovery of Constantinople from the Ottoman appear an obligatory as well as a predestined work. The spirit in which the Russian legions would march to the Bosphorus would, probably, differ little from that in which Grenada was invested by the levies of Castile.

Yet, with all these palliatives of conquest, and all this semblance of warrant, it is unquestionable that the sentiments which the occupation of Constantinople by Russia might awaken in the cabinets of Europe would be seconded by the opinion of every people between the Vistula and the Atlantic. Though the Turks, even in the fourth century of their European existence, still sit like barbarous conquerors on the lands they won, though they retain in servitude and degradation millions of Christian subjects, though they perpetuate the hopeless desolation of vast provinces, and though these provinces are the very fairest regions of the known world and the most famous scenes of ancient story; — yet for all this, in the event of an invasion, they would command the sympathy and favour of thousands to whom the ‘balance of power’ would be a strange and unintelligible proposition. For the conclusions of statesmen there would no doubt be sufficient warrant in the obvious danger to public peace and freedom from the aggrandisement, by such vast acquisitions, of a Power already so menacing and aggressive as Russia; but their main source, we think, must be sought in that popular instinct which naturally inclines to the weaker side, — and with a stronger and more decided bias as the violence attempted to be exercised is more gratuitous — and cruel. The considerations which now tend to the disparagement of the Turks are feeble and inoperative, compared with those which are acting in their favour. They are semi-barbarians, and they are misbelievers: they have not improved, by the policy or enlightenment of their rule, the title which they originally derived from conquest: But they are as they were made. They retain their native impress of character, and they have repeatedly shamed States of more lofty pretensions, by their magnanimity, their generosity, their unswerving adherence to their plighted faith and presumptive duties, and by that disdainful grandeur of soul which refuses to avail itself of another’s error, and renders to misfortune a homage which had never been extorted from them by

power. Very recent events have shown that the communication of European forms to Ottoman institutions, however it may have affected the vigour and elasticity of the national strength, has, at least, not impaired the national virtues; nor has there, probably, been any period since the war, at which the encroachments of an overgrown Power upon its defenceless neighbour would excite more general indignation or induce more serious results. These are things within the daily observation of all; what we have previously deduced from the less obvious facts of history may elucidate, we hope, the character of the long-pending crisis, and facilitate the comprehension of the great problem which will be one day solved.

---

ART. VII. — 1. *Report of the General Board of Health on the Measures appointed for the Execution of the Nuisances-removal and Diseases-prevention Act, and the Public Health Act, up to July 1849.* Presented to Parliament.

2. *Report on Quarantine by the General Board of Health.* Presented to Parliament, 1849.

3. *Statement of the Course of Investigation and Results of Experiments as to the means of Removing the Refuse of Towns in Water, and applying it as Manure.* By EDWIN CHADWICK, Esq. C. B. Reynell and Weight, 1849.

SEEN through the departing shadow of a wide-wasting pestilence, the science which aims at preserving health by precautionary arrangements, now presents itself divested of the vulgar and unsightly attributes which formerly repelled public attention too much from its details; and stands forth in the true and pure light of its beneficent object — the saving of human life. In England alone, the average annual number of deaths from disease is, in round numbers, 300,000, — while that of deaths from the mere decay and exhaustion of the human frame by the progress of time, is only 35,000. In the difference between these two numbers we see the vast and vital field in which the sanitary reformer proposes to work. That disease shall ever be entirely exterminated, is of course beyond the belief or hope of the most sanguine: But every disease has somewhere its specific and efficient cause, — and that these causes can be removed, or much weakened in their action, in very many instances, is not only within the bounds of hope, but has been satisfactorily proved. When sanitary legislation gives us its successful results, they will be represented by the reduction of the number of those who die of disease, in their early days, or in the prime of

life — and in the increased number of those who have completed their allotted course in health and been peacefully gathered to their fathers.

Accordingly sanitary improvements have not directly in view the extension of the *natural* period of human life, but only the removal of influences which *artificially* curtail it. The opinions of Condorcet and his disciples, therefore, are widely distinct from the inductive philosophy of those who have demonstrated the benefit of removing from the vicinity of man those external poisons which embitter and abridge his existence. Their object is not the vain one of indefinitely protracting existence by human art. It seems indeed a remarkable fact, whence something has yet, we think, to be learned, that wherever the average length of life is improved there is a tendency to equality; and that the miraculously long livers, appear chiefly where the average vitality is shortest, and where men subject to noxious agencies present in general the most attenuated and degraded physical condition, — as if it were an exceptional law of nature, that those whose frames can for a certain time resist these deadly influences, become, ‘like him who fed on poisons,’ hardened against the common causes of mortality. Nor, were we to suppose it in the power of art materially to enlarge the allotted span of healthy existence, and to make extreme old age the common lot, instead of the rare privilege of a few, — must we necessarily suppose the boon accompanied by a great increase of human happiness. Treatises *de senectute* have more than one aspect. In the general case, when a green old age has been reached, the task of life may be considered to have been performed, and its enjoyments substantially exhausted; the journey has been completed, and the tired body may part with the spirit in peace, leaving the arena of life to new competitors. The associations with which survivors surround the memory of their aged relatives are accordingly more tender than bitter. And such deaths, it is felt, do not so much make a chasm in existence as a natural change, consonant with the decay and reproduction which are the routine of the world’s progress. Young hands are strengthening their grasp to lead us forward in our journey through life, as the elder race waxes feeble and drop away. It is when the opening bud is blighted, or life is cut off in the full bloom of usefulness, — in the midst of happiness, affection, and esteem, — that the great calamities of mortality are exhibited. Such are the desolate spots of human existence, standing in the centre of its healthy fruition, waste and arid — showing happy aims defeated, and its joys engulfed in unfathomable sorrows. The science that promises in some

measure to mitigate the horrors of this howling wilderness, is surely an object before which sarcasm and faction and selfishness may well be dumb.

There are some initial views connected with this subject, on which a few years ago it might have been necessary to enlarge, but which may now, thanks to the enlightened perseverance of Mr. Chadwick and his coadjutors, be taken for granted as a part of the received creed of every intelligent observer. Whatever difficulties may still haunt the speculations of economists on the increase of population, no one now doubts that it is for the interest of the public at large, no less than for the happiness of the few immediately interested in each human being, that the life once breathed should, if possible, be preserved, until it is released by the natural wearing away of its earthly tabernacle. We all know that, in the economic sense of the term, a short-lived population is generally a surplus population, — not only because those who are reckless of preserving life will be careless of all its obligations, and will be poor and vicious, but because the tendency of early deaths is chiefly, to shorten the existence of those who produce more than they consume, and to increase the number of those who must be dependent on the charity of others. Sir W. Temple's antithesis, that we cannot care too little for life nor too much for health, must not be misunderstood. 'A cholera widow,' is a significant expression occasionally used by the Board of Health, to indicate one who has been thrown on the parish by the death of that husband who, if he had not been prematurely cut off, might have supported her for years, and left his children old enough to earn bread for themselves. Many communities are now thus paying, in alarmingly swollen poor-rates, for the short-sighted selfishness which made them grudge the cost of precautionary arrangements. These are truths which have now so far found acceptance throughout the educated part of society, that it seems unnecessary to examine at length the reasons for believing in them. Nor, while the value to the public at large of preserving every human life that can be preserved, is fully admitted, does any rational man doubt that there come into existence in all places, and especially where men are densely congregated, physical agencies destructive of life, which, though capable of being removed, are too often left to do their deadly work undisturbed. These broad facts appearing to require nothing to be said in their support, our remarks may be more profitably confined to some of the less obvious influences likely to be exercised by sanitary reform; and to an inquiry into the sources of the apathy, the prejudices, and the other difficulties which stand in the way of this class of improvement.

One of the primary prejudices—one of those least spoken of but most felt—which sanitary reform has to encounter, is a vague apprehension of undue interference. All regulations for securing cleanliness and removing filth, are apt to be considered as invasions of the privacy of the domestic hearth and the person, and amounting to an impertinent intermeddling, in matters concerning which it is insulting even to be inquisitive. But in reality the object of sanitary reform is to free the citizen from the vile fetters with which the acts of others have actually bound him, and to leave him free to pursue the natural tendency towards civilisation and refinement, rather than to assume any arbitrary control over his actions. We believe it to be quite true that it always injures the individual to do for him what he ought, and is able, to do for himself. But the operative workman must live in the city, or starve; and if selfish wealth has made the city such that he cannot find a cell in it which is not a living tomb, saturated with corruption—then he is not left to the freedom of his own actions, but is subject to an abominable bondage caused by the conduct of others. The strength and skill of Hercules could not enable the city artisan of Glasgow to live in purity; and if legislation cleanses the Augean stable, it is not doing for him what he should have been left to do for himself, but only saving him from suffering by the selfishness of third parties beyond his reach.

In fact no nation which has made many steps forward in civilisation can be without some sort of Edile police: And the real grievance is, not that such a thing does not exist, but that it is so very imperfect and defective. Like most other great benefits, it will be better accomplished through enlightened and well weighed legislation, suggested by skilful minds devoted to the task, than by the blind chance which has hitherto ruled it; and one of its new qualities will naturally be its careful adjustment to the proper medium between obnoxious interference and fatal neglect. Hitherto such vulgarisms as sewers, drains, and other things not less important and still more vulgarly suggestive, were deemed to be the proper province of bricklayers, scavengers, and nightmen. A respectable builder or plumber might perhaps condescend to give his attention to such works—but scarcely, if he had risen to the rank of an alderman or bailie. So was it of old with the noble art of surgery, linked to the humble and almost servile craft of the barber. But the portentous influences connected with both fields of exertion, have at last dignified them, in spite of sordid and unpleasing associations. And neither is a recognition of the importance of such functions so novel as it may seem. The sanitary rules to which the Jews were subjected were part of their Religion—



as those of other Eastern nations still are ; and travellers who are acquainted with these countries, assure us that there are in Leviticus precepts still marvellously well adapted to the preservation of life. There were similar regulations both in Mexico and Peru. But the Romans were the most sagacious and extensive legislators in such matters. They were in many things masters of the practical ; and have left vestiges still pregnant with the wisdom of experience. With them nothing seems to have been deemed 'common or unclean' that could protect the public health. We find Pliny writing to Trajan about a fetid stream passing through Amastris, as if it were an affair of State. The cloacæ of the Tarquins are still among the architectural wonders of the world. The censors, ediles, and curators, who at different periods had charge of the buildings, and of the apparatus for the removal of impurities, were invested with great powers for the execution of their functions, and derived a corresponding dignity from them. The arrangements for supplying the houses of Rome with water were most minute. Those for ventilation and drainage, still traceable in the several remains of Roman amphitheatres, have struck our most advanced sanitarians with surprise at their remarkable adaptation to their purpose ; while Mr. Chadwick tells the Commissioners of Sewers that he has lately received from a friend in Zurich a specimen of exactly such an earthenware pipe as he is now recommending for the distribution of sewage. It had been laid down by the Romans, and 'has worked until recent times under 500 feet of pressure !' Indeed it is easy to see from Vitruvius, and from portions of the collection of Grævius, that the rules and operations for the protection of health in Rome, were of a very radical and peremptory character, and allowed no minor interests to interfere with them. It seems to have been a rule with them, that from the time when the foundation of a city was laid, to that of the summit of its greatness, no structural operation, public or private, should be permitted to take a shape which might render it a harbour either for disease or crime ; and it is to this vigilant forethought that, in the absence of other organising agencies discovered only in our later times, we may attribute the success with which that remarkable people preserved social order, throughout so dense and vast a mass of human beings as the inhabitants of the imperial city in the days of its greatness.

It is not creditable to this country that, by neglecting initiatory precautions, it should have allowed so much to be done which must now be undone. In the restrictions which prevent every man from doing for his own profit or gratification that which inflicts on his neighbour a deadly injury, there is no hardship ;—it is simple justice. Our law requires that the railway

company, the master of the steam boat, and the manufacturer of gunpowder, should respectively conduct their operations so as not to endanger the safety of the community; and there can be no reason why the same responsibility should not be attached to those whose profitable occupation is building or spinning. Such intervention on behalf of the public is not to be confounded with the old sumptuary laws,—for it interferes with things, not with persons; nor can it be compared to attempts to regulate labour and wages, or to restraints on trade,—for it is not done to procure, by the artificial adjustment of something which men can best settle for themselves, some speculative advantage, but, on the principle of *salus populi suprema lex*, to protect one set of human beings from being the victims of disease and death through the selfish cupidity of others. The owner of the soil is the person who mainly profits by the accumulation of a city population,—his, at all events, are advantages for which he neither toils nor spins; and many of the princely fortunes of our day have been created by the rapid rise—often causeless and capricious, so far as the owner himself may know—of city populations. It does not seem then to be a very hard rule either of morality or law, that a proprietor, who accumulates wealth by any such means, shall be compelled to submit to regulations which, should they even in some degree reduce the amount of his gains, may be a security, against the lives of those who by the necessities of their position are enriching him, from being sacrificed to his avarice or his recklessness. While he derives a profit by letting out his square yards of the earth's surface, it surely is not unfair that he should become bound not to transfer it to the occupant perforated throughout with pit-falls in which health and life may be lost.

But this is not the only form in which there is a debt due to the more miserable classes in our cities, by the wealthy and the well to do. The progress of wealth—and even the progress of civilisation, in so far as the great outward manifestations of civilisation may be held its types,—has the effect, when it is partial, of deteriorating the class that is thrown out in the race or lottery of life. When, through the influence of external circumstances which they are unable to control, a portion of the population remain as all originally were, their position is lower than that of the first common barbarism. This term is applied to communities who are nearly all on a level—with habits which, as they are not directed by the lights of civilisation, have not been formed in its shades. And accordingly we cannot attribute to the American hunter or the Arab wanderer any of the degradation which invests the no less savage occupant of a large town, who skulks round the corner

when he sees a policeman, and scowls at the rich man's carriage rolling over the muddy road, where he traces the impression of his children's naked feet. The two classes of barbarians are as distinct from each other as the moss-stained stream that passes through a heath-clad moor, and the continuation of the same stream, black and greasy, from having served the fifty steam engines, and received the manifold impurities, of a large manufacturing town. Civilisation and wealth have been the causes of this degradation; and it must be their function, knowing what they now cannot fail to know, to remedy the evils they have unconsciously inflicted.

Indeed, the neglected refuse of civilisation has the faculty of nourishing social savages among mankind, just as it provides the favourite haunts of the vermin which frequent sewers and dung heaps. If the arrangements for preserving physical purity are not made for all, but only for those who can easily pay for them, not only will the poorer classes be left in their own natural debasement, but will become the recipients of all the additional filth which their richer neighbours cast off. A not uncommon occurrence where a town has rapidly increased is, that a village inhabited by the humbler classes, nestled in a pleasant dell beside a river, where the natural facility for drainage, and pure air, kept the people clean and healthy, has been changed into one of those degraded suburbs, described with dreary uniformity of misery in the sanitary reports, which the skill of Crabbe could not improve upon; because a few gay handsome streets, inhabited by rich people, have converted the neighbouring heights into a city of palaces; and all those impurities, of the existence of which the fastidious citizens are scarcely aware, are now sent down to flood the poor inhabitants of the pristine village.

But the higher and the middle classes have, besides the obligation of plain justice, a great and palpable *interest* in making sacrifices for the purification of their degraded neighbours, so far as this can be accomplished without destroying self-dependence. We cannot separate ourselves from uncleanness and misery by mere walls and lanes, and remain safe. The way in which the Cholera pursued its career is a marked type of the common interest which all classes have in keeping each other above that Slough of Despond—utter physical degradation. Filth and vice drew it first to their favourite seats, as the loadstone draws iron; But when it was once introduced within the limits of a city community, none were wealthy or moral or wise enough to be safe from its stroke. Those who are permitted to lag far behind the onward march of their neighbours, are always dangerous as well as melancholy objects. The human

being who has sunk below a certain level naturally gravitates to depths still lower; and it depends greatly on the objects with which he comes in contact, whether he is impelled forward or is arrested in this progress. Wherever the first needs of life are too easily obtained, or where the body of a people is not obliged to labour as a condition necessary to their self-respect, there is a dangerous tendency to lean on such facilities — and abandon the efforts of self-sustentation, which ennoble, or keep erect, the better races of mankind. This propensity is widely exhibited among those nations whose happy climate demands little care or labour for the mere support of animal existence; and was well illustrated by that ingenious magistrate who predicted, that if the Strand were lined with empty casks, they would all be speedily occupied by people who would rear a cask-living race. It may seem hard to deprive the wretch of the bulk-head or empty cellar, which he is content to make his idle home; but it is one of those hardships with which acts of mercy often must begin. When the frightful demoralisation of Liverpool was recently exposed, and it was shown that between thirty and forty thousand inhabitants of that fine city lived in dens called cellars, the bold resolution was taken of at once *amputating* this morbid mass, by rendering cellars illegal habitations. The operation commenced in 1842; and after about 3000 people were ejected, a more stringent method was adopted in 1847. The operation of removal — under the judicious management of Dr. Duncan, the medical officer of health — was gradual, but systematic and steady; and near the end of 1849, 4700 cellars had been cleared of 20,000 inhabitants! Time enough has not elapsed to let the full effect of this bold measure be seen; but the officer of health has already had to report the significant fact, respecting one of the districts formerly most afflicted by poverty and disease, that while the last epidemic preceding the clearance carried off 500 inhabitants, — the Cholera, which broke out during the time that the forced change of residence was in progress, slew the comparatively small number of 94.

An overflowing abundance of evidence, confirmed by the experience of every dweller in towns, shows that the unclean districts, which are the great centres of disease, are at the same time the great nurseries and fortresses of crime. The mind suffers in these cases with the body. Wesley was well aware of the connexion when he said, — Cleanliness was next to Godliness. That criminality can be abolished by sanitary reform, or by any one measure, is, alas! a vain expectation: but great hopes of a diminution may be rested on any system which shall destroy the existing strongholds of vice, as the merchant cities destroyed those of the robber barons. The history of the world has always

been affected by the external circumstances in which its inhabitants have been placed. A spirit of freedom—a determination not to be absorbed into any of the great aggregates which form the leading empires of the world—a chivalrous and warlike character, have generally distinguished the inhabitants of inaccessible districts. Thus the same natural cause has produced similar moral traits, in places otherwise so unlike each other as the mountains of Switzerland and Dalecarlia, the bushy labyrinths of La Vendée, and the swamps of Holland. If, therefore, we artificially create physical anomalies in our cities, we must expect to find a people assimilated to them; and so we have the city mountaineers of the Lawn Market, and the amphibious squatters in the Goose Dubs, or the Angel Meadow of Manchester—a race as rugged according to their own peculiarities, as those whose mountains lift them to the storm. Their spirit of independence, to be sure, is a defiance of all laws human and divine; their enthusiasm is the zealous pursuit of every vice in whose service the skill of civilisation can pander to the appetites of barbarism; their chivalry is in the mutual bond to help each other's wickedness; and their warlike spirit is developed in a constant battle with the law. And yet we are inclined to believe that, to a very great extent, society might be cleared of these wretches by the mere removal of their natural strongholds,—as a district relieves itself from panthers and rattlesnakes by clearing a jungle.

Such an object, we have already said, would be well worthy of a sacrifice by the middle and upper classes. But we believe that the operation would, in the end, be better described as a good investment. Like the draining and clearing of land, it would speedily more than repay itself in plentiful fruit. Nor would that fruit be an unsubstantial and visionary one, in the vague return of increased public health and improved morality. It would represent itself in hard cash, according to an account in which the tax for sanitary reform should be set down as a cheap fore-stalment of poor-rates, prison assessments, and taxes to support the administration of criminal justice.

It is in vain to expect that the wide operations necessary for the accomplishment of measures so comprehensive, can ever be efficiently conducted through purely local movements. Whoever may transact the actual business, there must be somewhere a suggesting and directing skill of the highest order. Let us just glance at the physical ravages on Nature effected by the rapid rise of a great manufacturing town, and think whether it is at all likely that such a creation should ever be willing or able, of itself, to supply a remedy for the mischief it has done. In a valley between undulating grassy hills, dotted with trees, runs a clear brook, sedgy here and rocky there, whose speckled

trout show the purity of its waters. The passing traveller, or indolent loungeur, acknowledges the grateful influence of uncontaminated air, of pleasant sounds, and sweet smells—and sighs to think how sadly a large portion of his fellow men are cut off from such enjoyments? Let us suppose him returning to the spot twenty years afterwards, while in the mean time some manufacturing or trading facilities have brought about the sudden erection of a considerable town in the cheerful valley. The dense darkness of a smoky atmosphere now covers every thing. There is not a green leaf or blade to be seen, save some hemlock and nettles flourishing in neglected courtyards. The surface of the soil is everywhere saturated with putrescent filth. Of the human beings brought to the spot by the temptation of high wages, a large portion live in dens, damp, dark, and pestiferous. With the pristine tastes and habits enjoyed by them, when they first came there, they would have preferred to occupy fitting human habitations had they been able to obtain them; but now they are assimilated to their abodes. The stream that once ran clattering on, is sluggish with every variety of suspended ordure, and black as ink; the bubbling escape of poisonous gases is a dismal mockery of the leaping of the trout. The parched citizens are panting for water, while the surrounding moors, from want of drainage, are soaked in wet; and the impurities that would enrich the cold damp soil, are making havoc of the lives of the people. Let us hope that such a spot has yet another revolution to go through—that the stream will again run pure, though its banks be more artificially ornamented than of old,—that open spaces fresh and green may greet the wearied labourer's eyes, and tempt his children to healthy pastimes away from the gutter and the dung-heap,—that trees may cast their shade, as in former times, in summer evenings, over pleasant groups who have learned to prefer the sounds and sights of Nature to those of the gin-palace. That such revolutions may be made, we have actual experience in the improvements which have taken place in the parks and open spaces near the portions of our great cities occupied by the aristocracy. 'If the most fashionable parts of 'the Capital,' says Mr. Macaulay, 'could be placed before us such 'as they then were (in the reign of Charles II.), we should be 'disgusted by their squalid appearance, and poisoned by their 'noisome atmosphere. In Covent Garden a filthy and noisy 'market was held close to the dwellings of the great. Fruit- 'women screamed, carters fought, cabbage-stalks and rotten 'apples accumulated in heaps at the thresholds of the Countess 'of Berkshire and of the Bishop of Durham. . . . St. James's 'Square was a receptacle for all the offal and cinders, for all the 'dead cats and dead dogs of Westminster. At one time a

' cudgel-player kept the ring there. At another time an impudent squatter settled himself there, and built a shed for rubbish under the windows of the gilded saloons, in which the first magnates of the realm — Norfolks, Ormonds, Kents, and Pembrokes — gave banquets and balls. It was not till these nuisances had lasted through a whole generation, and till much had been written about them, that the inhabitants applied to parliament for permission to put up rails and to plant trees.'

The progress of true civilisation indeed, is best marked, we should say, by the facility with which men may crowd together into large city communities, without suffering from the confusion and the pollution which such accumulations would naturally create. Art is here employed to bring us back to Nature; and, with the conveniences and pleasures of intercourse, to give us no small portion of the personal independence, and the freedom from offensive sights and associations, which pursue the dweller in the desert. The children reared round the Regent's Park are heirs of all the civilisation of the greatest city in the world, and can hold converse with Nature in meadows, trees, and flowers, — and in the very wild beasts that are the terror of the savage! But far different are the children of St. Giles and Angel Meadow: Even for them however, we trust, a better day is dawning; and what the aristocracy have done for themselves, satisfactorily shows how far human ingenuity and perseverance have it in their power to discard the dregs of progress and preserve its benefits alone.

But that communities which have grown up in degradation will never be able, unassisted, to emancipate themselves from this servitude, is almost self-evident. Left to themselves they will remain as they are; nor do the paltry attempts which some corporations, under the fear of the Cholera, and of the exposures to which they have been subjected by the promoters of sanitary reform, have made to relieve themselves from the scandal of their position, afford much ground for reliance on municipal efforts. Whatever *hands* may do the local work, there must be wise and able *heads* to suggest, and sometimes to command. The advantages of having, in relation to such a matter, a central body, with at least one mind wholly devoted to the great object in view, and with continual access to the most enlightened intellects, both at home and abroad, are too great to be perceived at once, or easily estimated. The 'Report on Quarantine,' which has been translated into French and Italian, and is rapidly passing over the globe, was but the first year's fruit of the Board of Health; and it bids fair to set commerce free from one of its most vexatious and most costly trammels; nay, more — if its views be sound, as we cannot

help believing that they are—it teaches the beneficent doctrine, that it is by kindness and good offices, not by isolation or flight, that we may best protect ourselves from the great scourges of mankind. From such a body only can we hope for comprehensive projects for public works,—uniform, effective, and economical. It is very clear that the persevering and searching intelligence, which has predominated in all inquiries and suggestions as to the public health, is finding its way towards a great discovery, which will do as much to change the aspect and condition of our towns as gas or pavements. We refer to the plans now ripening for the removal of the impurities of great cities, and their distribution over the soil as manure,—by operations which will strip them, not only of their noxious but even of their offensive character. Thus we may hope, that what has hitherto disgusted the senses, brutalised the minds, and shortened the days of the dwellers in great cities, may become a most needful help to our suffering agriculture. From the same authority there doubtless will proceed arrangements for communicating supplies of water through crowded communities, in a form far more abundant, economical, and complete, than either trading companies or local corporations have yet dreamed of.

For reasons to be afterwards more fully stated, we consider it right that such a board should be immediately connected with the Government. We believe that some not unnatural jealousy has been felt by the medical profession as to the constitution of the present board; but we cannot regret the circumstance that its chief operative leader is not a physician. It is very necessary that such a department should have the best scientific council and assistance that the country can afford, and the debt which it owes to the recent services of Dr. Southwood Smith, Dr. Sutherland, and other physicians, cannot well be overrated; but, on the other hand, it seems indispensable that an administrative body, coming in contact with constitutional rights and responsibilities, should have another kind of leadership. To balance the heroism and disinterestedness, for which we most willingly give them credit, the medical body have some defects, especially in their jealousies and prejudices. It is difficult to get them to countenance anything inconsistent with what they have long seen and practised; and they would certainly not be so ready as laymen to give way to the collective wisdom of their own brethren. We firmly believe, in short, that the first physicians in the country will more frankly communicate to such a board as the present, their individual convictions, than to any convocation of their professional brethren; and that the board will more candidly weigh and more cheerfully adopt their views. The value of unprofessional superintendence—



the same class of persons who are to execute arrangements never being entirely the same as those who devise them — has been evinced in the management of the Admiralty. It has been appositely remarked, that Nelson would never have obtained high command from a board of old admirals. Nor is it un-instructive to remember that, though they have liberally responded to it, the idea of sanitary reform on the scale which we are now considering, did not *originate* within the medical profession: And, in truth, the constant direction of the faculties to the cure of actual disease does not seem likely to leave much observation to devote to the study of its external causes.

But the chief difficulty with which all general efforts for the preservation of the public health have to contend, is the cry against centralisation. People say that we are departing from the foundations of the free institutions of our Saxon ancestors, — when in reality we are strengthening and expanding them. It should be remembered, that a Government board means a board responsible to Parliament. A central board in this country, directing and helping local authorities, is, therefore, as different from a central official administration in the other great States of Europe, as a Representative Government is from a Despotism.

We are quite alive to the great importance of the people in general becoming acquainted, through the local management of their own affairs, with the efficient mechanism of a representative system; and have often expressed the opinion, that it is chiefly in such matters that our nation has shown that aptness for order and system, in which the impulsive people of France, and the graver, but more theoretic people of Germany, appear to be deficient. But we believe these practical qualities to be inherent in the nature of our people; and do not think they require to be factitiously encouraged, to the detriment of the public business, by leaving that to be done by local representative bodies, which can be better done by official functionaries, — responsible to the country, and morally, as well as legally, bound to give the public real and efficient service, in return for the trust reposed in them, and the salaries with which they are paid. There is, indeed, only a certain amount of business that can be expected to be gratuitously done by local representative bodies; and it is quite possible, in the midst of a national fervour in favour of local action, to overtask these capabilities. It is worth while also to bear in mind, that municipal corporations, although their character was considerably raised by the measures which about fifteen years ago widened their basis, do not now hold the important and critical position, which they had at one time to maintain, as the protectors of the people against the power of a great feudal aristocracy. They may still be useful for the

transaction of some kinds of business; but they are no longer necessary for the safety of our liberties.

Such being their position at present, we may, without disrespect to great constitutional authorities, examine whether they perform their actual functions either effectively or economically; a question which should be viewed in connexion with the opinion, that local representative management is, as a principle, so very valuable to the country at large, that it is worth being paid for in the form of a considerable addition to our taxation. There can be no doubt that a large per-centage on our fiscal burdens must be attributed to taxation by means of local bodies; but we confess that we have a partiality towards this branch of the public expenditure, were it only more economically applied: And we believe that such a supervision as the Board of Health exercises over local boards, will tend eminently to produce this result; without, in the least degree, injuring the efficacy of these bodies, — and with a great saving to the community, of expenses which local boards would generally incur; though more from ignorance than intention.

It is in truth a fond hallucination that local elective bodies are now practically responsible to their fellow-citizens, whose money they dispose of, and whose service they profess to have at heart. No people, we verily believe, having the interests of their fellow-creatures in their hands, are generally more callous, more confident in their official station, more scornful of valuable counsel, and less amenable to ministerial or legal responsibility, than the great majority of these elective bodies. We fear, indeed, that there are very few cases in which the constituencies take a sufficiently active interest as vacancies occur, — unless when some accident surrounds the election with a partisan or a personal excitement. There is accordingly, little scrutiny into the character and motives of the individuals, who desire to become members of them; and the whole management of their often very important concerns is apt to fall into the hands of men neither respected by, nor known to, the people — of whom, notwithstanding, they are held to be the representatives. And we think we can explain the efficient cause of this. Even in this country, where public virtue is at a higher point, and where there is a greater willingness than in most others, to make personal sacrifices for the general interest, there is only a certain per-centage of available and really valuable gratuitous service ready to be given by respectable persons to the public. But that limited fund of service has, of late years, been very largely drawn upon, by railway and other joint-stock companies; and, of course, there is a comparatively smaller quantity of it now left for purposes purely municipal. The constituencies, in short, do not generally bestir

themselves to look out good men for these offices: and, if they were looked for, they would not now be found in sufficient numbers—for purely gratuitous services.

It must be remembered, at the same time, that local powers do not now rise into existence as they probably did of old, by purely local and spontaneous movements. All new authorities, whether representative or administrative, are, in these days, brought into existence only by the national legislature. The local boards of health in England are created through the intermediate agency of a responsible administrative power created by the same national legislature; and are, wherever they supersede the operation of local acts, subject to the sanction of Parliament, applied by a public general statute. Now the only question of public interest obviously is, whether the system pursued in passing local statutes, or that under which these local boards are erected through the ministerial intervention of the General Board of Health, is best calculated to promote the interest and the wishes of the local constituencies, and most likely to subject the persons who tax their fellow-citizens and spend their money, to a real responsibility? Until a very late period local acts—conferring great powers on individuals, interfering with property, sanctioning taxation, and involving, in almost every shape and shade, the most important public interests, were passed without any inquiry being made beyond the precincts of St. Stephen's; and we believe that the present system, under which such acts are preceded by local investigation, is an improvement for which the public are indebted to the chief promoter of the Public Health Act. Certain notices, indeed, were appointed to be given in assigned newspapers but they were generally expressed in technical terms intelligible only to legal practitioners, who often founded a valuable interest in supporting or in opposing the measures so announced. Plans were also deposited in certain places; but they were rarely seen by the bulk of the population, or examined by any one, except the attorneys who sought out good cases for opposition or claims of compensation. The bulk of the population, in short, seldom knew any thing about the local act, until they were assessed to pay high rates for defective works and for legal expenses,—to an amount often as great as the cost of the works themselves. The parliamentary costs of a water bill for Liverpool amounted to 20,000*l.*,—a sum that it is said would have paid for the effectual drainage of nine thousand of the worst-conditioned houses in that city. In the much smaller town of Dundee, 30,000*l.* were expended in a parliamentary battle between the projectors of a general system of supplying water to the community, and the proprietors of some wells who objected to being taxed for the convenience and health of the

public: And we believe the opposition was so truly formidable, that after an act embodying something like a compromise between the contending parties had been passed, the profession of a water-vender was still a common one in the streets of that crowded, filthy, and unhealthy town.

Now, in the machinery by which the Board of Health brings local boards into existence, there is a far fuller security for all parties being heard and made acquainted with the objects in view. The inquiry is conducted in the town itself. Due notice is given, and the inspector attends and takes evidence publicly. He is not unfrequently examined and cross-examined by those who are to be the ratepayers; who may possibly, from old experience of high rates and worthless services, have doubts and jealousies to be appeased. When the inspector has made his own local examination, he submits his report to the General Board, who direct its local publication in such a manner that all who are interested may have access to it, — and indeed the local editors generally find it worth their while to reprint and publish it in a cheap form. In the report the changes proposed to be made are distinctly set forth; and notice is given that during a month suggestions or objections will be received. If any matter of fact is challenged, or any point left obscure, another examination is made; and generally all local doubt or opposition is silenced before the measure, embodied in a provisional order, is finally submitted by the Board to Parliament. The expense of these operations is, we believe, usually not more than one fifth of the average expense of an unopposed local statute — such as those numerous police acts, which display every variety of local prejudice and legislative blunder. The system has as many advantages over the old one, as uniformity, skill, and anxious attention have over legal complexity and diversity, carelessness and selfishness. The remark on the state of unrevolutionised France, that the traveller changed laws as often as he changed horses, was becoming oppressively applicable in this country; where every town was obtaining its separate police act, — each as unlike its neighbours as jealousy and divergency of tastes could make it, — each large enough to form a national code, and each profusely scattering penalties around it, among a public notoriously ignorant whether they were obeying its injunctions or neglecting them.

It is therefore precisely in the system ignorantly called irresponsible centralisation, that we see the country's security for a real and vital responsibility, diffusing itself through the whole system — both central and local. Without doubt a general board, not immediately responsible to Parliament, would exercise a

power little under the influence of public opinion, and too apt to be abused. But *local* irresponsible boards would be liable to the same objection. If they are an object of really great interest to the people, and create party-divisions and competition, the minority is ruthlessly trampled down by the majority. But more commonly the public apathy leaves the management of the whole in the hands of a few self-interested men, who have their own reasons for seeking office and managing the public business. Inquiries into misconduct, and attempts to eradicate fixed abuses, have ever been in such cases hard, tedious, and depressing tasks. But when at the head of the whole department there is, as in the present instance, a cabinet minister, liable to be questioned in Parliament, the responsibility to the country is complete and instantaneous. Let a single damaging case be made out,—let even papers be moved for which there is reluctance to give, or a question be asked that is awkwardly answered,—the whole system quivers with alarm, and the charge passes through to its destination, though originating in the humblest department of a local board, like an electric shock. Thus the General Board, if it be a centre of power, is also a centre—and a very sensitive centre—of responsibility. But we must always remember that its proper functions are, not the practical enforcement of sanitary rules, but the creation and embodiment of the local boards, and the imparting to them assistance and advice in the performance of their duties. If an individual, or a parochial board, should have made any great discovery in practical sanitary arrangements, it would be a toilsome task to persuade every local body of its efficacy. But as responsibility is ramified from the centre, so is light and knowledge. Ere the Cholera had approached our shores, the Board of Health, after tracing with sedulous vigilance its footsteps through every part of the world, and concentrating all that had been seen and known regarding it by the most skilful and sagacious men in all countries, were able to devise precautionary arrangements having the effect of arresting the progress of the pestilence. In the face both of the great experience and of the skilful deduction from that experience which were thus put before the public, and of which other European nations are now gladly taking advantage, many corporate bodies, in their self-conceit, chose to adopt totally different views, and to let the people die in thousands. They showed in this what was to have been hoped for from their unaided local efforts; but it was one of the advantages of the new system that their conduct has been exposed, and recorded as a warning for the future. Indeed, the thousand ways in which a body of competent and able men, with the great resources of the science of the nation at their dis-

posal, may impart knowledge, both of the existence of evils and of their probable remedies, cannot well be estimated or even conjectured. The sanitary condition of the mercantile navy — a subject in which the British public might well be supposed to take an interest — has been for the first time announced to the public by the Board of Health. It has been shown by them that many of our ships are moveable cellars, — as ripe fever-nests as any of the Liverpool cellars, — and as urgently standing in need of amendment.

Another great service likely to be performed by such a Board is at the same time the source of animosity towards it. On the matter of sanitary reform, the interests of individuals and of classes will often be at variance with those of the public, which it will be the duty of the Board to protect. With attorneys seeking popularity and business, — with dethroned local authorities, — and especially with owners of small and unwholesome houses, whose profits are enlarged by the degradation of the people, — whoever seeks to enforce a Public Health Act must lay his account with waging incessant war. The Board of Health have, in their General Report, thus announced their views and intentions on this matter : —

‘ Considering the provisions made for the satisfaction of the rate-payers with the application of the act, we should hesitate to recommend the enforcement of its provisions against the general and deliberate wishes of the inhabitants of any town, when the intended measures were placed fully and fairly before them. But in the face of proved facts of preventible evils under which the great bulk of the population of a town may be suffering, we should be cautious in accepting as the real expression of opinion, declarations against remedies, unless under scrutinies and precautions, such as experience has suggested in relation to the guises assumed by such interests as those above indicated.\* We should not accept as expositions of the aversion of “the people,” or of the unwillingness of the town, declarations which we know to be got up on ignorant or false representations by the owners of the worst conditioned tenements, in respect to which it may be requisite to adopt compulsory measures, or by local functionaries whose powers it may be necessary to supersede ; or by one local party in the mere spirit of opposition against the measure which may happen to have been initiated by persons belonging to another, or to no local party whatsoever.’ (P. 67.)

It is painful to think that it is among those middle classes where we otherwise find the best citizens of the State, that opposition to sanitary reform has chiefly shown itself, and is likely to continue. But we do not hesitate to say that their

---

\* Viz., those of small house proprietors, who get themselves represented in the elected managing bodies, to suit their own interests.

opposition to it is generally as selfish as it is barbarous. There is unfortunately a sensitiveness against meddling with the *abuses* as well as the *uses* of property in this country, which seems to drive the comfortable classes frantic when anything can be called or made to appear an infringement on absolute and sometimes offensive rights, — and then compassion, justice, and the still small voice of reason will appeal to it, as to other frenzies, in vain. But let the middle classes be cautious, and be at the trouble to understand the question. If they now run their eye over society from its summit to its base, they will see that the one great remaining and most dangerous gap is where the middle class ends and the working class begins. It were well that this gap, like the others that have been but are no more, should be filled up, or smoothed over; and that can only be done when the humblest classes shall have shaken off a portion of the debasement which now hangs about them: Or the wealth which is retained through a selfish refusal to co-operate in this good cause, may in the end be found not so secure, as all who love the advancement of civilisation, as well as the security of property, must ever wish to see it.

ART. VIII. — *Histoire de la Révolution de 1848*. By A. DE LAMARTINE. 2 tomes. Paris: 1849.

THE most valuable materials for the history of great events are undoubtedly afforded by the autobiographies of those who took a distinguished part in them. They perceived the importance of details which a bystander would have neglected. They knew what was proposed and what was decided at secret councils; they can tell us what they themselves did, and, what is often very different, what they intended. Such narratives, however, are comparatively rare: And those which we possess have generally been *written* long after the events — when the recollections of the narrator had lost their first vividness; while their *publication* is often delayed still longer, until the contemporaries of the writer have passed away, — perhaps until he has passed away himself, — so that much of the restraint, which the liability to denial and exposure would have imposed on his inventions or on his suppressions, has been removed. The memoirs of M. de Talleyrand, for example — which we are only to have twenty years hence, will not be received with the confidence which they would have deserved if they had been published in his lifetime, or even immediately after his death: And one of the great merits of M. de Lamartine's work is its freedom from these objections. It must have been written within a few

months of the events which it relates; and it is published while almost every other actor in that great drama can protest against its statements or supply its omissions. On the other hand, of course, this proximity has its inconveniences. M. de Lamartine cannot feel as impartially as if his work had treated of times long since passed; or speak as boldly as if it had been intended to be posthumous. In following the course of this narrative, we accordingly often wish for names where we find mere designations, and for details where we find only general statements. Much is obviously concealed from us which it would have been useful to know, but dangerous to tell. Undeserved praise, too, appears to be frequently awarded; and deserved blame to be still more frequently withheld. These objections, however, are far more than counterbalanced by the freshness and vivacity of the narrative: a freshness and vivacity which even as great a poet as M. de Lamartine could not have given to it, if he had written it ten years later. But it is not what it calls itself. It is not a History of the Revolution of 1848. It is an account of what M. de Lamartine said and did from the 24th of February to the 24th of June in that year. But, as he took a great share during that period in the creation, organisation, and direction of the Republic, he cannot tell his own story without interweaving that of the Revolution. The accessory, however, is always kept in proper subordination to the principal. What we are told of the fortunes of France is always subservient to the real subject of the work—the fortunes of M. de Lamartine. We shall treat the work therefore, not as a history, but as an autobiography. As the former it would be meagre and unsatisfactory; as the latter it is as copious as we could wish it to be.

But before we proceed to the personal narrative, we must say something of M. de Lamartine's opinions as to the causes of the Revolution—partly because those opinions obviously influenced his actions, and it would be unfair to criticise his conduct, without stating what were the circumstances under which he supposed himself to be acting,—and partly because our own view of those circumstances differs very widely from his, and we wish to submit both to the judgment of the reader.

‘If a revolution,’ says M. de Lamartine, ‘is the result of immoral or personal causes, if its source be in the crimes or in the solitary greatness of one man, or in ambition, national or individual—in a sovereignty disputed by different dynasties, in a national thirst for war or for conquest, or even for ill-acquired glory, or, above all, in mutual hatred between classes of fellow countrymen,—*such* a revolution is a prelude to decline, decomposition, and to national death. If a revolution be the result of a principle, of reasoning, of feeling—



of an aspiration, however blind, towards a better organisation of government or of society, of a thirst for the improvement of the relations of citizens to citizens, or of the nation to other nations,—if it spring from a lofty idea, not from an abject passion,—*such* a revolution, even in its calamities and in its errors, is a proof of vigour, of youth, and of life—which promises to the race which effects it, a long and glorious period of growth. Such was the French Revolution of 1789, — such is that of 1848.\*

In criticising so rhetorical, and so vague a writer as M. de Lamartine, it is necessary to ascertain, so far as it can be ascertained, the sense in which he uses his terms. Revolutions arising from the first class of causes are, he says, ‘des préludes de ‘décadence et des signes de décomposition et de mort dans une ‘race humaine.’

Now what is national death? Is it the destruction of separate nationality? Are Scotland, Wales, and England *dead*—because they have coalesced into Great Britain? Had Flanders, Brittany, Burgundy, Normandy, Alsace, and Lorraine more life when they were independent, than since they have become parts of France? During the last 3000 years the inhabitants of Persia and of Greece have been subject to every vicissitude to which a people can be exposed. They have been split into tribes, they have coalesced into kingdoms, they have been parts of great empires, they have been subject provinces—and yet, neither the Greeks nor the Persians have ever ceased, or, as far as we can perceive, are ever likely to cease, to be living nations. The only sense which we can affix to the words ‘national death’ is positive destruction. Such destruction as was the fate of the inhabitants of some of the Roman provinces on the irruption of the barbarians; or such as the Spaniards inflicted on the inhabitants of Hispaniola. But such a destruction can be produced only by an exterminating war. A revolution, without doubt, by weakening for a time the power of a nation, by injuring its finances, by rendering disaffected a large portion of its population, by disturbing its existing relations with other countries, and by placing at the head of its affairs inexperienced and violent men, is likely to bring on it foreign war, and to render that war disastrous. But modern war, however mischievous, is not destructive. It may retard the increase of population, but does not positively diminish it. France herself, during the course of the long, and ultimately disastrous, wars which arose out of her revolution, constantly increased in population. The Hungarian revolution has produced one of the most sanguinary wars of modern times: but

no one believes that it has materially diminished the population of Hungary. National death, therefore, '*la mort dans une race humaine*,' is a calamity to which a great civilised nation is not exposed.

'National decomposition' is a term more easily intelligible. It must signify the separation of what was one nation into two or more. Such an event was the division of the Netherlands, in the seventeenth century, into the Dutch Republic and the Spanish Netherlands; and when, after two centuries of separation, they had again coalesced, their redivision into Holland and Belgium. Such was the decomposition of the British Empire, when our North American Colonies became the United States. But such events are not necessarily calamities: they were not calamities in any of the instances which we have mentioned. And they are quite as likely to arise from '*une idée morale*,' as from '*une passion abjecte*.' The decomposing revolutions which created the United Provinces in the seventeenth century, and the United States in the eighteenth century, had all the marks which M. de Lamartine ascribes to glorious and beneficial revolutions. That which created the Belgian nation, in the nineteenth century, had his marks of a mischievous revolution: its source was in individual and sectarian ambition, and mutual hatred between classes of fellow-countrymen. Yet all three proved to be steps in national advancement: and all three promise to the nations which have effected them long periods of prosperous growth.

The most decomposing revolution that the world has ever seen,—the revolution which split the Hispano-American empire into fragments, each of which is breaking up into still minuter particles,—had a moral and rational origin. It arose from impatience of a government which, even among colonial governments, was eminently bad, and from a hope of social improvement which no one suspected to be ill-grounded.

In fact, we are inclined to believe, that the most dangerous revolutions,—those which are most likely to arrest, or at least to retard, the progress of civilisation,—are those which, according to M. de Lamartine, promise its long and glorious advance;—those which are attempts to introduce speculative principles into practice, and to recast society in new and improved forms. Such would have been an Irish revolution for the sake of repeal, a chartist revolution for the sake of the five points, a socialist revolution for the *droit au travail*, a communist revolution in order to abolish inheritance. The mischief of a revolution indeed, is, in general, in proportion to the amount of change which it introduces. The English revolution of 1688, the 18<sup>e</sup> Brumaire,

and the 29th of July, in France—three revolutions distinguished by their preponderance of good,—produced each scarcely any immediate changes—except putting at the head of each nation a new governor, abler than the one who was ejected. They were all personal revolutions: and the characteristic of such a revolution generally is, that a nation changes its administrators, but retains substantially its institutions. We shall proceed to offer some reasons for believing that the revolution of the 24th of February, 1848, began as a personal revolution, and was turned into an organic revolution, only by a strange combination of audacity, accident, and weakness.

We are bound, however, to begin by letting M. de Lamartine give his own version:—

‘The revolution,’ he says, ‘of 1848 was a continuation of that of 1789; with fewer elements of disorder and more of progress. Each was the explosion of a principle [*idée morale*]. This principle was the People. The People, which in 1789 threw off servitude, ignorance, privilege, prejudice, and absolute monarchy. The People, which in 1848 threw off oligarchy, monarchy, and exclusive representation; and proclaimed the right as well as the interest of the masses to govern. Now the regular accession of the masses to political power, whatever objections may be made by a statesman, is *a moral truth*, self-evident to the heart as well as to the intellect of a philosopher. A revolution pregnant with this principle is a revolution which carries with it life. At such a revolution God is present; and when it has passed, the people will be found to have grown in force, in virtue, and in rights. Some false steps it may make, from the ignorance or impatience of the masses, or from the factious sophistry of men who will try to substitute themselves for the nation: But it will get rid of these men; it will expose these sophistries, and will bring out and mature the seeds of reason, justice, and virtue which God has implanted in the bosoms of Frenchmen. In this second crisis of our revolution I took part; and I shall endeavour to describe it—in order to show to the People its own portrait in one of its greatest hours, and to hand down to posterity the honours of our times.’\*

From this view of the causes of the revolution of 1848 we utterly dissent. We believe, indeed, that its ultimate source was a theory; but not, by any means, the theory from which M. de Lamartine deduces it,—the theory of universal suffrage. The theory to which we would, in a great degree, attribute the revolution of 1848 is, a disguised Socialism. It is the theory which almost every Frenchman cherishes, as respects himself—that the government exists for the purpose of making his for-

tune, and is to be supported only so far as it performs that duty. His great object is, to exchange the labours and risks of a business, or of a profession, or even of a trade, for a public salary. The thousands, or rather tens of thousands, of workmen who deserted employments at which they were earning four or five francs a day, to get thirty sous from the *ateliers nationaux*, were mere examples of the general feeling. To satisfy this universal desire, every government must go on increasing the extent of its duties, the number of its servants, and the amount of its expenditure. It has assisted to subject every Frenchman to the slavery of passports—because they give places to some thousands of officials. It preserves the monopoly of tobacco—because that enables it to give away 30,000 *débîts de tabac*. It takes to itself both religious and secular instruction. It has long taken charge of highways, bridges, and canals, the forwarding of travellers and letters. It has secured the reversion of all the railways, and threatens to take immediate possession of them. It proposes to assume insurance of life and against fire; mining; lighting, paving, and draining towns; and banking. Even with the branches of industry which it still leaves to the public, it interferes by prescribing the modes in which they are to be carried on; and by favouring some by bounties, others by loans or gifts, and others by repelling competitors. For these purposes, it pays and feeds 500,000 soldiers, and 500,000 civilians! For these purposes the 500 millions of expenditure, which were enough during the Consulate, rose to 800 in the Empire,—to 970 under the Restoration,—to 1,500 under Louis Philippe,—and to 1,800 millions under the Republic.

M. Dunoyer, from whose ‘*Révolution du 24<sup>e</sup> Février*’ we borrow many of our remarks, thus sums up the influences of this mode of government on the national character:—

‘The natural effects of these measures have been, to turn  
 ‘aside more and more public attention from real reforms, and to  
 ‘excite more and more the bad passions of the nation; to feed  
 ‘and to extend, with the rapidity and generality of an epidemic,  
 ‘the taste, already so strong and so diffused, for the pursuit of  
 ‘government employment and government favours; to pass it on  
 ‘from the Chambers to the electoral colleges, and from thence to  
 ‘every class of citizens; to transform the relations between the  
 ‘governed and the government into one organised system of  
 ‘universal place-hunting; to induce the government to make  
 ‘full use of the innumerable powers of interference which it has  
 ‘accumulated; to make a traffic, not merely of its offices, but  
 ‘of its administrative functions; of its right to grant mines, to  
 ‘make, or to allow, or to refuse roads,—to authorise the cultiva-

'tion of wastes or forests, — to allow theatres to be opened, and  
 'of hundreds of other powers — all more or less stained by  
 'injustice or usurpation. The government was tempted to  
 'strive to multiply and extend, from day to day, these mis-  
 'chievous powers; and to exercise them with reference only to  
 'the importance of the applicants and their means of repay-  
 'ment. And it yielded to the temptation, without compunction  
 'or even hesitation. It professed to be indulgent, to know the  
 'world, to understand and to humour the weakness of human  
 'nature. It may still have wished for *ability* in its servants; but  
 'it is not certain that it was equally anxious for *integrity*: this  
 'was not thought a practical quality. I am not sure that in  
 'certain quarters, where cleverness and dexterity were highly  
 'prized, it was not the fashion to say that a government could  
 'do without the esteem of the people.'\*

We believe, in short, that the most wide-spreading and deep-seated cause of all the revolutions which have convulsed France since the 18<sup>e</sup> Brumaire, have been partly the measures which every government has thought necessary in order to keep up this system: and partly the animosity of the excluded factions, which have been constantly endeavouring to upset the existing administration, in the hope of sharing the favours of that which they intended to put in its place. In order to meet a rapidly increasing expenditure, violences, exactions, partialities, and almost frauds take place, which render the mass of the higher and middle classes indifferent or even hostile to their rulers; and a set of pampered functionaries are a weak defence against a host of enemies, hungry, rapacious, and unscrupulous, who care little whether what they overturn be a ministry, a dynasty, or a constitution. The great founder of the system was Bonaparte; and he had advantages which have not been enjoyed by his successors, and was free from some of their most embarrassing difficulties. His empire extended over a third of Europe; and he could cover a great portion of it with French administrators, without expense to France. The national debt, which now devours a fifth of the national income, was then an almost imperceptible burden: And one of the great sources of the present popularity of his reign, is undoubtedly, the recollection of its comparatively light taxation. The only parties then excluded from office were the fierce Republicans and the violent Legitimists. Every one else might hope for his turn of employment or promotion, without changing the distributor of

---

\* La Révolution du 24<sup>e</sup> Février, par M. Dunoyer, Conseiller d'Etat, Membre de l'Institut, p. 44.

patronage. The Republicans, however, and the Legitimists were his terror during his whole reign. Twice they united against him, and each time he was overthrown; the Legitimists taking the lead in 1814, the Republicans in 1815.

The restored government again was besieged by all the Faubourg St. Germain, by all its emigrant friends, and by a whole army of the functionaries of the Republic and of the Empire, driven back upon France from her relinquished territories. It strove to provide for them, by reviving as many as it dared of the abuses of the old *régime*; by carefully maintaining, and where it could by increasing, those of the Revolution and of the Empire; by repressing every liberty through which its profligacy could be attacked; by dispensing with juries; by suspending the freedom of the press; by interfering with the elections; and, when it was met for the second time by an irresistible majority in the Chamber of Deputies, by abolishing the constitution. And it fell, because it had sacrificed things to persons; because, instead of trying to benefit the whole country, it had striven to purchase a part of it; and because it had nothing to oppose to the united attack of the Republicans and Bonapartists—except an army which was Bonapartist, and a set of favourites debased by eighteen years of wealth, patronage, and power.

Then came Louis Philippe. He found the political world divided into Republicans, Imperialists, and Legitimists. The Legitimists of course were his worst enemies. The Republicans and Imperialists, to whom he really owed his throne, he tried to purchase in the old way,—by place, and power, and protection, and privilege. In the celebrated prophecy which he delivered in the Chamber of Deputies on the 27th of January, 1848—on the very eve of the great outbreak—M. de Tocqueville affirmed that the success of this attempt had been complete—that the revolutionary king had possessed himself of greater powers, of greater patronage, of a more efficient and more extended prerogative, than had been enjoyed by any of his predecessors—that under the influence of the atmosphere of corruption with which the government had surrounded itself, a new moral code had been established, according to which the man who possesses political rights owes it to himself, owes it to his children, to his wife, to his relations, to make a personal use of those rights for their benefit. He asked all his auditors whether this morality was not making daily progress? Whether this conduct was not becoming the duty of the father of a family?

But though the unparalleled prosperity of France under his reign enabled Louis Philippe to raise the public expenditure

from 970 millions to 1,500 millions, the number of those whom he could satisfy was of course small, compared with the number of those whom he was forced to disappoint. The heterogeneous body that had united to substitute him for Charles X. instantly broke up. One fragment of it became the Louis-Philippistes—the king's friends: a mischievous faction, which, in a constitutional government, is always created by a meddling sovereign. With them the parliamentary party for the time being in power coalesced; or rather it was by coalescing with them that parliamentary power was obtained. Arrayed against that party was the *opposition dynastique*—opposed to the ministry, but not to the dynasty—or even to the monarch, excepting so far as he identified himself with his minister. These two parties were the necessary incidents to parliamentary government: the ins and the outs. But behind them was that portion, by far the majority, of the Bonapartists and of the Republicans, whom the crown had not the means of purchasing. Of these factions the former was formidable from its numbers, the latter from its violence. And each has since, to a certain extent, succeeded. But it was not till the autumn of 1847, that either seemed likely to obtain much influence. Much more was feared from a fifth party, the Legitimists, who, though they entered the Chamber of Deputies in small numbers, were a constant nucleus of disaffection, always endeavouring to make the existing government work ill.

Though Louis Philippe was able to bribe a steady majority in the Chamber, and to enable that majority to bribe a steady majority of the electors,—though he could buy hundreds, and enable those hundreds to buy thousands, yet he could not purchase millions. He could not prevent the existence of an opposition; probably he would have been sorry to lose that check on his ministers. And he could not prevent that opposition from directing against his administration, and at last against his person, a system of attack more uncandid, more unscrupulous, and, if possible, more immoral than the defence. Every year, in pursuance of this plan, at the beginning of the session, some grievance was seized on or invented; blown up into gigantic dimensions, and suffered to collapse into insignificance as soon as the address had been voted. One time it was the 'recensement des portes et fenêtres,' another the 'affairs of Poland,' another the 'droit de visite,' another the 'Pritchard indemnity,' another the 'Spanish marriages.' And each and all of these were forgotten as soon as they had served their turn. One subject only was kept constantly before the public—the necessity of perpetually increasing the army and navy. This answered more than one

purpose. It flattered the national hatred of England; it flattered the national ambition, the desire of influence and interference, which every Frenchman believes to be the natural relation between France and her neighbours; and, by forcing the government to have recourse to a constantly increasing taxation, it helped to render it unpopular.

In the recess of 1847 and the beginning of 1848, the selected object of attack was political corruption, and the specific cure was parliamentary reform. And this was undoubtedly the most dangerous ground on which the government could be assailed. First, because the imputation of corruption was well founded, though not peculiar to Louis Philippe; and, secondly, because the frightful and disgraceful events of the autumn of 1847 had filled France with terror and disgust, and led men to look with hatred or contempt on a government and a court, among whose high dignitaries were such men as Teste, Cubières, and Choiseul-Praslin. Then too the *opposition dynastique*, for the first time, joined the Republican and Legitimist factions — fancying that it could now lead those whom, when the contest came, it found itself forced to follow. Had it not done this — had it not been too impatient to wait the slow process of parliamentary warfare, it must in time have obtained parliamentary reform — and, what was far more its real object, office and power. By joining the anti-dynastic parties, however, by appearing at banquets at which the king's health was not to be drunk, by countenancing all the truths and some of the calumnies with which the court was assailed, they produced, or at least fostered, in the Parisian *bourgeoisie* and in the National Guard the disaffection which made these great bodies favour the *émeute* during the two first days — when the slightest exertion would have stifled it; and on the third day made them obey in stupid astonishment the handful of ruffians who then proclaimed the Republic.

We do not of course believe that the great bulk of those who actually made the revolution were actuated by the hope of power or of place. But that the majority of the educated revolutionists were thus actuated, we have no doubt. We have no doubt that the editors and writers of the 'National' and the 'Réforme' intended to do precisely what they did — to make themselves the ministers, or functionaries, or *protégés*, the Thiers's, the Rolands, or the Mignets of a new form of government. The masses could have no such pretensions. But they too hoped to profit by a revolution; not, indeed, as individual objects of the favour of the new government, but as partakers of the blessings which the triumph of Socialism was to diffuse.

The place-hunting of the higher orders, the socialism of the



lower, the intense centralisation of France, the paternal administration of Austria, some of Lord Ashley's and Mr. Sadler's plans for England, and all Mr. Poulett Scrope's for Ireland seem to us to arise from the same deep-rooted error as to the proper functions of government. All arise from a theory that it is in the power of the State to correct the inequalities of fortune. And the error is a plausible one. Men, whose reasoning faculties are either uncultivated or perverted by their feelings or their imagination, see the great power of the State, and do not perceive its limits! They see that it disposes of great resources; and do not perceive how easily those resources may be not only exhausted, but dried up. They are struck by the contrast between great superfluity and great indigence, between lives shortened by indolence and lives shortened by toil, by wealth squandered unproductively while cultivable lands lie waste and labourers ask in vain for employment. When excited by such a spectacle, what is more natural than to propose laws, by which the toil which appears to them excessive shall be forbidden, by which the government shall provide the strong with employment and the weak with relief; and obtain the necessary funds, partly from the superfluity of the rich, and partly by taking possession of the productive instruments which their present owners are too idle or too timid to turn to the best advantage? It requires a long train of reasoning to show, that the capital, on which the miracles of civilisation depend, is the slow and painful creation of the economy and enterprise of the few, and of the industry of the many, and is destroyed, or driven away, or prevented from arising, by any causes which diminish or render insecure the profits of the capitalist, or deaden the activity of the labourer. And that the State, by relieving idleness, improvidence, or misconduct from the punishment, and depriving abstinence and foresight of the reward, which have been provided for them by nature, may indeed destroy wealth, but most certainly will aggravate poverty.

Besides these, there was a third class of important actors in the revolution, to whom M. de Lamartine has but slightly alluded,—those who took part in it from a mere puerile love of excitement. It is humiliating to be forced to believe, that the secular destinies of France, and, to a considerable extent, those of the whole Continent, have been influenced, and perhaps may be influenced for centuries to come, by a riot got up by a few hundred lads, by way of a lark. But such was the case. Boys of fifteen or sixteen, *illustres gamins* as they are seriously called by M. Caussidière\*, took a principal part in the little of real

---

\* *Mémoires*, vol. i. p. 40.

fighting that took place. A spectator of the revolution told us that he saw a boy of eleven years old lurk behind a wall and fire on an officer as he rode by. The man fell, mortally wounded: the child ran away, frightened and crying. Of course it is absurd to suppose that such champions could have been actuated by the serious motives, by the '*idéés morales*,' the '*soif de perfectionnement*,' or the '*aspiration vers un meilleur ordre de gouvernement*,' with which M. de Lamartine endows the heroes of the 24th of February; or even by the desire for power, or place, or patronage, for themselves, or for socialist institutions for their country, which we believe to have been the motives of the adult rioters. Such feelings and such desires do not belong to children, however precocious the Parisian *gamin* may be. But, for two or three years they had been reading and seeing representations of the Great Revolution. Theatres were opened, in which it was acted in pieces that lasted, we believe, for whole weeks. The shops and the stalls along the Quays and the Boulevards, and in the Courts of the Louvre, were covered with portraits of its chiefs, and with prints exhibiting its principal scenes. Thousands of copies of M. de Lamartine's '*Girondins*' were sold in cheap forms, in numbers, or by subscription; and probably as many thousands more were lent out to read at a price which the lowest workman could afford. The picturesque vividness with which that remarkable book is written, the dark grandeur with which its sanguinary heroes are invested, the success of every insurrection that is described, the irresistible power which is ascribed to the people, not only familiarised the populace with ideas of revolt and street war, but created, in young and ill-regulated minds, thirsting for a new excitement, an intense desire to reproduce such scenes. They wished to see a 10th of August,—and they made one!

But we are detaining the reader too long with accessories; we must quit the background, and come to the portrait itself.

M. de Lamartine has many claims to public attention; more in number, perhaps, than any one of his cotemporaries. He is a poet, an orator, a philosopher, an historian, and a statesman. His statesmanlike qualities may be collected from the story which we are about to relate. His merits as an historian we considered two years ago\*, and we see no reason to alter our verdict. His claims as a poet and an orator cannot be disputed. They are matters not of inference but of fact. The object of a poet is to please,—that of an orator, to persuade; and the man who obtains eminent success in his art is a great artist.

A critic may think that he sees objections to the means adopted : he may wonder at the taste of the nation which could be pleased with such poetry, or at the reasoning faculties of the auditors who could be moved with such arguments ; but he must bow to success. The poet or the orator may have been himself aware of these objections ; but if he could so best obtain his object, he was right in disregarding them. M. de Lamartine's poetry is not fitted for English popularity : scarcely any French poetry is. But in France, its success has been rapid and universal, and he stands at the head of her living poets. From this judgment the only appeal is to that of posterity ; and it would be presumptuous — for foreigners especially — to anticipate its reversal.

M. de Lamartine's success as an orator has been still more brilliant. The words of no other living speaker have so much affected the destinies of mankind. His influence has resembled that of Mirabeau and O'Connell united. Both Mirabeau and O'Connell, indeed, preserved their influence much longer ; Mirabeau, in fact, kept his till death. O'Connell until extreme age and bodily weakness. M. de Lamartine's is, for the present, suspended. But, while it lasted, it was more decisive, more instantaneous in its effects, and exercised under less advantageous circumstances, than either of theirs.

O'Connell could inflame only those who wished to be inflamed. He could govern only those who wished to be governed : he could push them forward only in the way in which they wished to advance. Against a hostile audience he was powerless. But M. de Lamartine has preached peace to those who panted for war ; moderation to those who desired nothing but extremes ; and reason to those who knew only passion. And, armed with no force but his own voice, he has convinced the prejudiced, guided the passionate, and subdued the ferocious ! Mirabeau entered an assembly which had no ascertained duties, no defined powers, and no fixed purposes. He persuaded that assembly to assume supreme legislative authority, and to exercise that authority by creating a constitution. He showed great courage, great eloquence, and wonderful presence of mind and rapidity of decision ; but it cannot be said that he displayed these qualities in the face of any great difficulties. The associates over whom he acquired the mastery were unaccustomed to public life. They were not arrayed in parties, disciplined by mutual confidence, and accustomed to obey recognised leaders. The Assembly was a mob ; and, like a mob, submitted at once to the guidance of the boldest, the most decided, and perhaps, we may add, one of the least scrupulous, of its members. M. de Lamartine did not

acquire over his colleagues in the Chamber of Deputies any permanent ascendancy. He never frankly attached himself to any party. His opinions, as we shall see hereafter, were inconsistent with the maintenance of the existing institutions of France—perhaps with the permanence of any institutions whatever. And he was opposed to several of the most experienced and most dexterous debaters, and to one or two of the greatest speakers, in Europe. But he enjoyed one half day of influence such as seldom falls to the lot of man. It was the last morning of the Chamber. When he entered the Palais Bourbon on the 24th of February, it seems to be admitted that on him it depended whether the next event should be the march of the Duchess of Orleans to the Tuileries—or the march of a provisional government to the Hôtel de Ville! Whether he acted wisely in selecting the latter alternative, we must not now discuss, as we are not now considering his merits as a statesman; but to have had the power of selecting, and to have selected, for France one of these two events, was an almost unparalleled triumph for an orator.

M. de Lamartine's progress in philosophy, at least in the philosophy of government, may be estimated from the political creed contained in the second book of this work. We will extract it in the original; as we are afraid to incur the responsibility of reproducing the eloquence of some portions of it, and of affixing a meaning to others. M. de Lamartine always speaks of himself in the third person.

‘ Il avait employé deux ans à voyager en Orient. L’horizon du monde agrandit la pensée. Le spectacle des ruines des empires attriste, mais fortifie la philosophie. On voit, comme des hauteurs d’un faite géographique, surgir, grandir et se perdre les races, les idées, les religions, les empires. Les peuples disparaissent. On n’aperçoit plus que l’humanité traçant son cours, et multipliant ses haltes, sur la route de l’infini. On discerne plus clairement Dieu au bout de cette route de la caravane des nations.

‘ Les principes politiques de Lamartine étaient ceux de l’éternelle vérité dont l’Evangile est une page. L’égalité des hommes devant Dieu, réalisée sur la terre par les lois et les formes de gouvernement qui donnent au plus grand nombre, et bientôt à l’universalité des citoyens, la part la plus égale d’intervention personnelle dans le gouvernement; et, par là bientôt, dans les bénéfices moraux et matériels de la société humaine.

‘ Le Communisme des biens—qui amène nécessairement le communisme de la femme, de l’enfant, du père et de la mère, et l’abrutissement de l’espèce—lui faisait horreur. Le Socialisme dans ses différentes formules, saint-simonisme, fourriérisme, expropriation du capital sous prétexte d’affranchir et de multiplier le produit, lui faisait pitié.

‘Pénétré des avantages de la propriété, ce véritable droit de cité des temps modernes, il aspirait à éteindre graduellement le prolétariat, en appelant à la propriété plus universalisée, le plus grand nombre, et bientôt l’universalité des citoyens. Mais la première condition de cet appel successif à une part de propriété dans la main de tous, était le respect de la propriété dans les mains des propriétaires ; des négociants, des industriels déjà élevés, par le travail et par l’hérédité de la famille, à cette dignité et à ce bien-être. Déposséder les uns pour enrichir les autres, ne lui semblait pas un progrès, mais une spoliation ruineuse pour tous.

‘Ces deux idées principales, que Lamartine croyait assez saintes et assez mûres pour valoir l’effort d’une révolution, étaient entièrement désintéressées. Elles ne profitaient qu’à Dieu et à l’humanité.

‘L’une était l’avènement des masses au droit politique, pour préparer de là leur avènement progressif, inoffensif et régulier à la justice—c’est-à-dire à l’égalité de niveau, de lumière et de bien-être relatif dans la société.

‘La seconde était l’émancipation réelle de la conscience du genre humain—non par la destruction, mais par la liberté complète des croyances religieuses. Le moyen à ses yeux était la séparation définitive de l’Etat et de l’Eglise. Tant que l’Etat et l’Eglise seraient enchaînées l’un à l’autre, par des contrats simoniaques, par des salaires reçus et par des investitures données, l’Etat lui paraissait interposé entre Dieu et la conscience humaine.’\*

Universal suffrage in politics, (for so we must interpret his ‘avènement des masses au droit politique,’) and what is called the voluntary system in religion, are then M. de Lamartine’s two instruments for the regeneration of mankind. He thought their acquisition worth the certain calamities, and even the uncertain dangers of a revolution.

If France had been in the state of Spain during the Inquisition, or of Ireland under the penal laws, or even of England during the reigns of the Georges, when all but the members of one sect were by law excluded from office and trust, when to deny the doctrine of the Trinity subjected the offender to heavy penalties, and no one could be married without using the rites of the Church of England,—a considerable sacrifice, though not, we think, the terrible one contemplated by M. de Lamartine, might have been wisely made in order to escape from such a thralldom. But the religious freedom of France was, at all events, already perfect. A man’s faith had nothing to do with his advancement in the world, or with his position in society. Louis Philippe’s last prime minister was a Calvinist ; the wife selected for the heir of his throne was a Lutheran. Among the members of the Provisional Government was a Jew. The ministers of all religions, however, were salaried ; and as nineteen

twentieths of the French were Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholic clergy of course received the principal share of the ecclesiastical budget, and had the use of the public ecclesiastical buildings. The ecclesiastical change therefore, for which M. de Lamartine is willing to pay a revolution is merely the suppression of this salary. He must believe, therefore, that a clergy dependent altogether on their flocks for their support, would teach a far purer doctrine, enforce a much sounder morality, and give more useful advice than the present *curés*, who are almost completely maintained at the public expense. He must suppose that when their subsistence depends solely on the favour of their hearers, they will utter more boldly, unpalatable truths; and that they will be more active in correcting the prejudices and reproving the faults of their congregations, though they know that by doing so they may incur dismissal or impoverishment. He must shut his eyes to the profitable superstitions, and, we fear we must add, to the profitable immoralities, which it must be the interest of a clergy living from the dues and the offerings of the uneducated classes, to tolerate and even to promote: And he must forget what are likely to be the political notions of a priesthood sprung from the lower classes,—attached by blood, by sympathy, and indeed by social intercourse to those who must appear to themselves to have drawn the blanks of the social lottery,—and excluded by the restrictions of their profession from the moral discipline which other men receive from the struggles of active life and the endearments of domestic life. We have had some experience of the working of the voluntary system in a Roman Catholic country:—in connexion, to be sure, with a Protestant establishment. We know what is the sort of religion, the sort of morality, and the sort of political feelings which have been its consequences—among the priests and among the people; and we earnestly hope that France may escape this enormous addition to her other sources of error and disturbance.

M. de Lamartine's other great measure, for which he was ready to offer his life, and in fact did offer it a hundred times, was 'the obtaining by the masses political rights, as a means of their obtaining justice; that is to say, equality among all classes in position, in knowledge, and in welfare. Institutions which should give to the whole body of citizens a perfectly equal personal share in the government, and thence in the moral and material advantages of society. [*Lois et formes de gouvernement qui donnent à l'universalité des citoyens la part la plus égale d'intervention personnelle dans le gouvernement, et par là bientôt dans les bénéfices moraux et matériels de la société.*]

These opinions, at all events, are not taken from the common-places of political philosophy. The received doctrine up to this time has been, that men ought to obtain political power by means of knowledge, morality, and property; not knowledge, morality, and property by means of political power. The novelty, however, of opinions is no absolute objection to their soundness: But their inconsistency is. And M. de Lamartine's creed contains doctrines which we find it impossible to reconcile. Communism fills him with horror, Socialism with pity. The possessors of property are to keep it; they are to transmit it to their children. The landlord and the tenant, the capitalist and the labourer, the lender and the borrower, are to make their own bargains. To take from one man in order to give to another, appears to him not progress but robbery ruinous to both parties.

But, upon these terms, how does he propose 'appeler à la 'propriété l'universalité des citoyens?' We can quite understand how the masses, once admitted to 'a perfectly equal personal share in the government of a country,' would produce in that country a 'niveau de lumière et de bien-être;' but what we cannot understand is, how are they to do this, *except* by means which raise M. de Lamartine's horror or pity,—by Communism or by Socialism,—by destroying all property, or by taking from one in order to give to another. Before he pities the schemes of Socialism, M. de Lamartine really ought to unfold his own. He should tell us by what means he proposes to correct the inequalities of fortune, originally produced by differences in talent, differences in economy, differences in industry, and differences in good luck—and, aggravated by gift, by marriage, and by inheritance: and if he cannot correct these inequalities, what becomes of all the justice which he promises? What becomes of his 'égalité de niveau et de bien-être'?

We do not believe, for ourselves, that any organic changes whatever are worth the evils and the risks of an insurrectionary revolution; at least to the generation that makes it. But, if there were any motive that could induce us to encounter those evils and to incur those risks, it would be the prospect of *escaping from* M. de Lamartine's favourite institutions—universal suffrage in politics, and the voluntary system in religion.

Had Louis Philippe shown any intention to adopt these institutions, M. de Lamartine tells us that he might have saved the monarchy. But none was shown; and he therefore saw without regret the approach of the only means by which they could be introduced—a revolution.

We now proceed to the narrative itself.

On the evening of the 23rd of February, 1848, Lamartine

had gone to bed, convinced that the riot was over for the night, and that the announcement of a new ministry would prevent its recurrence the next morning. And these anticipations were reasonable. No one could have expected, or even have taken into his calculations as possible, the follies committed by the government on the morning of the 24th. No one could have supposed it possible, that, at seven o'clock that morning, the new ministry would have required Marshal Bugeaud, the commander of the garrison of Paris, to recall his troops, which had penetrated without interruption to the heart of the insurrection, and were in possession of the principal barricades; or, that an hour or two later, just as the insurrection was recommencing, Marshal Gerard would have been substituted for Bugeaud; or, that when the rioters attacked the posts of the Gardes Municipaux, in the Place de la Concorde, and began to break into the Palais Royal, the troops would have been forbidden to resist them! *Quos Deus vult perdere priùs dementat.*

At half-past ten in the morning of the 24th, Lamartine was still at home. He did not intend to go to the Palais Bourbon, merely to hear the names of the new ministers announced. But he was now told that it was thought possible that the rioters might attack the Chamber, and if there were any danger, it was his duty to be present. 'Yesterday,' he said as he went out, alluding to the events of 1792, 'was a 20th of June. It forebodes a 10th of August. A king who capitulates with an insurrection is no longer king. The 10th of August will come; but it is still distant.' As he passed through the gateway leading to the Chamber, two generals, on horseback, met. 'What news?' said one. 'Nothing of importance,' answered the other, who was General Perrot, commanding the cavalry occupying the Place de la Concorde: 'the crowd is not numerous, and scatters at the least movement of my squadrons; and the best troops in Europe could not force this bridge.' The order prohibiting resistance was not then generally known; and Lamartine entered the Palais Bourbon, convinced that he had been brought there by a false alarm.

We now come to perhaps the most remarkable revelation in the whole work. In the vestibule he found seven or eight persons waiting for him. Who they were we are not told—or what they were, except that they belonged to the newspaper press. Even the names of the papers with which they were connected are not expressly stated—though the 'National' and 'Réforme' are plainly enough indicated.

They demanded a secret conference. Lamartine took them



into a distant apartment; the door was locked, and one of them thus addressed him in the name of the whole:—

“ We are Republicans, and we continue Republicans; but we can postpone the Republic if France is not yet ripe for it—if she would not yield to it without resistance, if there be more danger in launching her at once into the fulness of her destined institutions than in holding her on their brink. These are our doubts: do you resolve them. The people calls on you—it trusts you—what you say will be re-echoed,—what you will, will be done. The reign of Louis Philippe is over. But might a temporary sovereignty, in the name of a child, in the hands of a woman, guided by a popular minister appointed by the people and esteemed by the republicans; might such a phantom of monarchy suspend the crisis, and prepare the nation for the Republic? Will you be that minister? Will you be the guardian of our dying royalty and of our infant liberty, by governing the child, the woman, and the people? In our persons the Republican party gives itself up to you: we formally engage to bear you to power, by the irresistible impulse of the revolution which you hear roaring without. We will keep you there, by our votes, by our journals, by our secret societies, and by our disciplined forces in the deepest strata of society. Your cause shall be ours. France and Europe will believe you to be the minister of the Regent: we shall know that you are the minister of the Republic.” \*

Lamartine does not appear to have been surprised at the proposal. He does not appear to have doubted the power of seven or eight journalists to dethrone a king, create a regent, and appoint a minister! And he was right. The ‘National’ and the ‘Réforme,’ whose representatives stood before him, *did more than all this*, a couple of hours after. The scene reminds one of Tacitus’s description of the revolution which deposed Galba. The only difference is the substitution of the modern force—the press, for the Roman force—the army.

‘Suscepere duo manipulares imperium Populi Romani transferendum—et transtulerunt!’

He asked, however, time for reflection; not a day or an hour,—such periods are not given in revolutions,—but five minutes. And for five or six minutes he reflected, leaning his elbows on the table, and covering his eyes with his hands. At length he raised his head, and thus addressed them:—

“Gentlemen, you are devoted republicans [républicains à tout prix]—I am not. I look indeed, as you do, on republican government, that is to say, on the government of the people by their own reason and their own will, as the only purpose of civilisation,—as the only means by which great general truths can become laws. Other

governments are guardianships, admissions by the people that they are still minors—imperfections in the eyes of a philosopher, disgraces in the eyes of an historian: But I have no impatient or fanatical desire for any given form. All that I require is a progressive government, — a government neither preceding nor lagging behind the advancing column of the people, but keeping pace with the desires and instincts of its time. I am not, like you, a thoroughgoing republican; but I am a statesman; and as a statesman I think it my duty to refuse my aid in retarding the birth of the Republic. As a statesman I declare that I will not pull down the throne, but if it fall I will not lift it. I will be a party to no revolution but a complete, that is to say, a republican revolution.”

‘Here,’ says Lamartine, ‘there was a moment of silence. His audience looked astonished, stupified, and somewhat incredulous.’ He continued:—

“I will tell you my reasons. A great crisis requires a great force. If the king be deposed to-day, it will be the beginning of one of the greatest crises which a people has ever gone through in its progress towards a settled government. A reign of eighteen years, by a single man representing a single class, has accumulated behind it a mass of revolutionary ideas, impatience, resentment, and hatred, which it will be impossible for any new Monarchy to satisfy. The undefined reform which triumphs to-day in the streets, cannot assume an outline, cannot submit to limits, without throwing into instant opposition all the classes who will be excluded from power. Republicans, Legitimists, Socialists, Communists, and Terrorists, however opposed in their ulterior objects, will fling together their violence to overthrow the feeble barrier of a transition government. The peers share the odiousness of the Court. The press has rendered the deputies unpopular, and corruption has made them despicable. Their present constituents are an imperceptible minority. The army has lost its spirit, and doubts whether firing on the citizens would not be parricide. The National Guards will go with the opposition. The old respect for the king has been destroyed by his obstinacy and by his failures. With what elements of force will you surround the throne on which you put your child? Reform? It is merely a flag used to conceal the Republic. Universal suffrage? It is a mystery: But with a breath it will blow away your fragment of a monarchy,—your shadows of ministers,—your phantom of an opposition. Its second word may be monarchy or empire—its first will be Republic. You are merely preparing for it a royal prey. Who are to be the friends of the regency? The great proprietors? Their hearts are with Henri V. The middle classes? They think only of themselves and of their profits,—a disturbed minority to be followed by a reign of chronic sedition would ruin them,—they will demand the stability of a republic. The People? It is in arms,—it is victorious,—it is triumphant: the doctrines with which it has been fed for fifteen years drive it on to destroy not merely royalty, but authority.”

“The regency then would simply be a new Fronde, with the addi-

tion of democracy, socialism, and communism. Society defended only by a small minority and by a quasi-royalty, neither monarchical nor republican, will be battered from its crest to its foundations. This evening the people may be pacified by a regency,—to-morrow they will come to snatch something else: every assault will tear away some limb from the Constitution. Your successors will be more violent than you. They will find left by you just enough royalty to irritate without restraining. Your 20th of June will certainly have a 10th of August—perhaps a 2nd of September. One day the feeble sovereign will be required to erect the scaffold—another to draw the sword. Any refusal will occasion violence,—the people will taste blood,—woe be to them, if they acquire a thirst for it! You will have a civil war of hunger against property; the horrors of 1793, with socialism added to them. In endeavouring to prevent a woman and a child from sliding down the inclined plane of a tranquil dethronement, you will open an abyss of anarchy and blood, in which the rights of property, the ties of family, the whole civilisation of France, will perish.”

‘The audience,’ says Lamartine, ‘seemed moved.’ So he continued:—

“As to myself, I see clearly the succession of catastrophes which I should prepare for my country, if I were to attempt to stop the avalanche of the revolution, on a slope where every moment that it stays will add to the weight of its mass, and to the ruin of its fall. One power only can avert the dangers of a revolution in such a social condition as ours:—It is, the power of the people itself; it is the suffrage, the will, the reason, the interest, the hands, and the weapons of all,—it is the Republic.

“Yes, it is the Republic which alone can save you from anarchy, from civil war, from foreign war, from confiscation, from the scaffold, from the overthrow of society from within, and from invasion from without. It is an heroic remedy; but, in such times as these, the only effectual policy is a policy as bold, almost as violent, as the crisis itself. Give to the people the Republic to-morrow, and call it by its name, and you change its anger into joy, and its fury into enthusiasm. All who cherish in their hearts republican feelings,—all whose imaginations dwell on republican visions,—all who regret,—all who hope,—all who reason and all who meditate in France,—all the secret societies,—all the active and all the speculative republicans,—the people, the demagogues, the young men, the students, the journalists, the men of action and the men of thought,—all will utter only one cry, will crowd round only one standard—at first in confusion, afterwards in disciplined order, to protect society by the government of all its members. Such a power may be disturbed, but cannot be deposed, for its base is the nation. It is the only force which can protect itself,—the only force that can moderate itself,—the only power that can bring the voice, the hands, the reason, the will, and the arms of all, to protect, on the one hand, the nation from servitude, and on the other hand, property, morality, the

relations of kindred and society, from the deluge which is washing away the foundations of the throne.

"If anarchy can be subdued, it is by the Republic. If communism can be conquered, it is by the Republic. If the revolution can be guided, it is by the Republic. If blood can be spared, it is by the Republic. If a general war and invasion can be averted, it is by the Republic. Therefore, as a rational and conscientious statesman, free from all illusion and from all fanaticism, I declare, before God and before you, that if this day is big with a revolution, I will not conspire for a half revolution. I will conspire, indeed, for none: but I will *accept* only a complete one,—a republic.

"But," he added, rising from the table, "I still hope that God will spare my country this trial. I accept revolutions; I do not make them. To assume such a responsibility, a man must be a villain, a madman, or a God."

"Lamartine is right," said one of the auditors; "he has more faith in our own ideas than we have." "We are convinced," they all cried. "Let us separate; do what, under the inspiration of events, you think best."\*

We have extracted this conversation at full length, partly because it is a fair specimen of M. de Lamartine's eloquence, and partly from its great historical interest. Without naming them, it points out the real authors of the revolution. It tells us when and on what motives their determination to substitute

---

\* Vol. i. p. 161. The events of the last twenty years have given to French politicians a terminology for which we have no equivalents. 'La famille,' for instance, is used to signify the relations which, in civilised life, spring up among the members of one family. The communists are accused of wishing to destroy 'la famille.' M. de Lamartine maintains that it is only by the republic that 'la famille' can be preserved. We have sometimes used as a translation 'the ties of family,' and sometimes 'the relations of kindred;' but they are awkward paraphrases, and do not precisely represent the French idea. If 'la famille' had been an object of attack and defence in England, a brief elliptical term would probably have been invented to represent it. Another new term is 'la république,' to signify republican institutions, as monarchy, with us, signifies monarchical institutions. We might have translated it by the word 'demoeracy;' but though that word expresses correctly enough the sense of the term 'la république,' it has not the same associations. We have therefore generally used the words 'the republic,' though aware that this use of them is not good English. Another is 'crise,' to signify a perplexed state of things, of which the result cannot be foreseen. What increases the difficulty of translating M. de Lamartine, is the boldness and inaccuracy of his metaphors; thus, in the passages which we have just translated, he speaks of 'clôre la crise;' 'd'un mot et d'un geste il engloutira;' 'un politique audacieuse comme la crise;' 'la famille menacée par le cataclysme d'idées qui fermentent.'

an organic for a dynastic revolution was formed, and who was the instigator of that determination. After having related this interview, and the events of the next two hours, M. de Lamartine vainly disclaims any responsibility for the revolution. We do not believe him to be a villain—or a God; But if we were members of a tribunal before which he was tried for conspiracy to overthrow monarchy in France, we should not hesitate to say, ‘Guilty, upon our honour.’

Let us shortly run over the events as they are told by him. We have seen that at about eleven o'clock a deputation from the Republican conspirators, including representatives of the ‘National’ and the ‘Réforme,’ proposed to him to substitute for Louis Philippe the Comte de Paris as king, and the Duchess of Orleans as regent, and to place *him* over them as minister: that he objected to their scheme that such an arrangement would not last; and declared himself in favour of a republic, based on universal suffrage. That they expressed their conviction, and separated—being all agreed apparently on the course of action to be pursued.

Lamartine entered the Chamber; and sat apart, without exchanging a word with any of his colleagues. For the first hour nothing took place. From time to time a discharge of musketry shook the windows. Some of the deputies went out in quest of information; others got on the platform over the portico, and looked on at the unintelligible movements of the troops and the people in the Place de la Concorde. Suddenly the large door of the Chamber opened, and the Duchess of Orleans, leading her sons, and accompanied by the Duc de Nemours, entered. M. Dupin announced from the Tribune that Louis Philippe had abdicated and transmitted the crown to the Comte de Paris, with the Duchess as regent. This was not strictly true; Louis Philippe had not indicated the Duchess, but the Duc de Nemours as regent; as indeed had been settled by a law. But as the Duc de Nemours obviously yielded his pretensions to those of the Duchess, this irregularity might easily have been got over.\*

---

\* After the text of these pages had been printed, we received, from a man of the highest political eminence in France, a letter, from which we extract the following passage:—‘The Duchess of Orleans and her sons had just entered, and were at the foot of the tribune. An unauthorised mob had penetrated into some of the public galleries. It was unarmed, turbulent and factious; but showed no disposition to outrage, or even to menace. The Assembly was deeply agitated, but it was impossible to say in what direction. It resembled the sea,

This, however, was not the intention of the conspirators. First rose M. Marie, and after remarking the illegality of the proposed regency, suggested the usual revolutionary expedient—a Provisional Government. He was followed by Crémieux, who proposed that it should consist of five members, to be named by the Chamber. Laroche-Jacquelin, with the usual perverseness of the Legitimists, then aimed a blow at the only remaining authority—the Chamber: ‘You are no longer,’ he cried, ‘a Chamber—you are nothing.’ A body of rioters now rushed into the hall, but stood silent, rather as spectators than as actors. M. Marrast, the editor of the ‘National,’ who was in the gallery appropriated to the ‘Journalists,’ watching the progress of the revolution, then went out to bring in a bolder mob; and Ledru Rollin occupied the time, at first by declaiming against the proposed regency; and then, at the suggestion of M. Berryer, the other head of the Legitimist party, by proposing a Provisional Government and a Convention. There was now a cry for Lamartine; and he mounted the Tribune, feeling, as he says, that his voice was to be decisive. We have seen that his conduct was pre-arranged.

“The people requires,” he said, “a government national, popular, and irremovable. Where is its base to be found among the floating timbers of this shipwreck, in this tempest which has swept us all before it,—among these breakers, where wave after wave swells the tide that has overwhelmed us? Where is it to be found? Only by going down to the bottom of the people and of the country; by extracting from our national rights the great mystery of the sovereignty of all,—

---

‘in the first minutes of a storm, while the wind is perpetually shifting. Tired of this fruitless tumult, I left my seat at the top of the left centre, and made my way to Lamartine, who was at his usual place at the extreme right. He was standing, overlooking from his height and his position the whole scene,—his countenance unmoved and inscrutable. I laid my hand on his arm, and whispered, “Lamartine, “you see that the question now is not reform—but revolution. In half an hour, perhaps, our powers of control, or even of interference, will be over.” He made a sign of assent. I continued: “Your voice alone can master this tumult; your position, unconnected with any party, inspires confidence: ascend the tribune, or we are lost.” His eyes were fixed on the group formed by the Duchess and her sons. He did not turn them towards me, but pointing to the tribune, said, “While that woman and that child are there, I am silent.” These words showed to me that his mind was made up—and very differently from my expectations. I returned to my place without replying.’ This anecdote confirms M. de Lamartine’s representation, both as to the importance attached to his decision, and as to the early period in the debate when it was made.

the source of all order, of all liberty, and of all truth. In the name of the blood which is flowing, in the name of peace, in the name of the people exhausted by its glorious work of three days, I demand a Provisional Government."

Here, he tells us, the whole Chamber resounded with acclamations.

"A government," he continued, "which shall predetermine nothing on the subjects which now inflame our resentment, our anger, or our desires; or as to the nature of the definitive government which the nation, when it has had an opportunity of expressing its will, may think fit to adopt."

'Here,' he adds, 'a thousand voices applauded this reserve of the rights of the nation. "Name them, name the members of the Provisional Government," they cried.'

"The first duty," he continued, "of this government will be to put an end to the contest which is now raging;—the second to call together the whole electoral body,—and by the whole body, I mean all who are citizens because they are men,—because they are beings endowed with an intellect and a will."

Here he was stopped by the irruption of a fresh body of about three hundred rioters—those whom M. Marrast had gone to fetch. They came fresh from the sack of the Tuileries. The Duchess with her children and the Duc de Nemours then fled. M. Sauzet, the President, disappeared. Lamartine remained in the tribune, and desired Dupont de l'Eure to take the vacant chair, which rises immediately above the tribune. Lamartine was called upon to name the Provisional Government. He says that he refused: But as far as we can understand his very obscure statement, he also says that he complied. His words are, 'Il se borne à souffler tout bas aux scrutateurs, les noms qui se présentent le plus naturellement à son esprit.' But he adds that the *scrutateurs* handed these names up to Dupont de l'Eure, who proclaimed them to the mob. They were, according to our author, Marie, Lamartine, Ledru Rollin, Crémieux, Dupont de l'Eure, Arago, and Garnier Pagès. The four first, it will be observed, had prepared the way for their own appointment, by proposing in the debate a Provisional Government, and Dupont de l'Eure by aiding as president.

Scarcely had this list been proclaimed and assented to, than the mob began to wish to alter it. Lamartine therefore, with some of his new colleagues, hurried away from the scene of election, which might soon have been turned into one of dismissal, to instal themselves at once as a government, in the Hôtel de Ville.

It is to be observed, that the 'Moniteur,' whose account of

these proceedings M. de Lamartine generally follows, ascribes the nomination of Garnier Pagès to Ledru Rollin. It states, also, that after the first six names had been proclaimed, Lamartine and Dupont de l'Eure left the Chamber to seize the Hôtel de Ville, and that Ledru Rollin then read over again the list, adding the name of Garnier Pagès.

M. de Lamartine describes the manner in which M. Flottard introduced him and his colleagues into a small room in the Hôtel de Ville — which was their abode during the first twenty-four hours of their reign. From his story we are led to infer that they found it empty; and that the subsequent addition of Marrast, Flocon, Louis Blanc, and Albert to the Provisional Government, was a voluntary act of the seven who had been nominated in the Chamber of Deputies. But neither of these statements appears to be strictly true. M. Crémieux, who was one of the seven, thus relates the state of things at the Hôtel de Ville:—

‘ When we reached the Hôtel de Ville, to take possession of the government, we found, in the little room in which we passed the night of the 24th and 25th of February, Messrs. Marrast, Flocon, Louis Blanc, and Albert, who had got there before us. “ Who are you ? ” we asked. “ Members of the Provisional Government,” they answered. “ By whom appointed ? ” we inquired. I think that they answered, “ By the Democratic Society.” If we ourselves had been asked who appointed us, we might have answered that we were appointed in the Chamber of Deputies, but certainly not *by* the Chamber. Our only origin was a popular acclamation, — and they claimed the same title. So we took them as secretaries, — and afterwards as colleagues.’\*

Even this is scarcely correct. It is only in the ‘ *Moniteur* ’ of the 25th of February that they are termed secretaries. In that of the 26th, and in all subsequent numbers, they appear as members of the government. In the *Bulletin des Lois* they are never called secretaries, but a slight blank separates their names from those of the others for the first two days. On the third it disappears, and they are confounded with the others. In the ‘ *Moniteur* ’ of the 27th February (the third day of the existence of the Provisional Government), its members are ranged thus: — MM. Arago, Dupont de l'Eure, Albert (ouvrier), F. Marrast, F. Flocon, Lamartine, Marie, L. Blanc, Crémieux, Ledru Rollin, Garnier Pagès.

But the most important revelation as to the true origin or

---

\* Rapport, vol. i. p. 266.



the Provisional Government, is that contained in the evidence of Adolphe Chenu. 'I was,' he says, 'one of the twelve persons, who, in the bureau of the "Réforme," on the 24th of February, after the capture of the Tuileries, created the Provisional Government, at least that part of it which was not left to be created by the "National." At this meeting, with the assistance of some persons whom I added to it, we appointed Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc, Flocon, Albert, and, I rather think, Francis Arago, though I am not sure whether he may not have been appointed by the other meeting [that of the National]. We then appointed Etienne Arago director of the Post Office. Sobrier asked to be Prefect of Police; Caussidière was generally preferred: ultimately we appointed both. I went and installed E. Arago at the Post Office, and then conducted Caussidière and Sobrier to the Prefecture of Police.\*

A similar account is given by Caussidière. 'After leaving the Tuileries I went to the bureau of the "Réforme," where a body of insurgents were naming a government. When the citizens so appointed were gone to the Hôtel de Ville, to install themselves, two important places remained to be filled up — the Post Office and the Police. The Post Office was given to E. Arago. I proposed Baune for the Police; he refused. Flocon and Baune then proposed me, jointly with Sobrier. I refused at first, but was persuaded to accept.†

Another extract from Caussidière gives a glimpse of the relations in which the members of this Provisional Government stood to each other from the starting. On the 26th of February, forty-eight hours after the revolution, he visited them as Préfet de Police: —

'I found them,' he says, 'sitting round a large table. They were absolutely buried in mountains of torn paper, which filled the room up to one's middle. I stood in a window and looked on. They were at work on the draft of a decree, — which was soon torn up and added to the heaps at their feet! The war between the moderate and democratic portions of the Provisional Government was raging. The most violent seemed to me to be Flocon and Garnier Pagès — the former for energy, the latter for delay. In a short time Albert came up to me: "We are not getting on," he said; "I am out of my place here; I am very much inclined to resign."‡

All this is not very consistent with M. de Lamartine's

\* Rapport, vol. i. p. 187. † Mémoires de Caussidière, vol. i. p. 63.

‡ Ibid. p. 90.

account of his having himself created the Provisional Government—by whispering to certain persons whom he calls *scrutateurs* the names that most readily occurred to him. The truth we believe to be, that besides the preparatory meeting in the bureau of the 'Réforme,' there was also one either in the bureau of the 'National,' or, if held elsewhere, composed of the writers in that journal; and that at that meeting, some, at least, of the names afterwards proclaimed in the Chamber were decided on.

The obscurity which still covers many of the most critical portions of the revolution makes us anxious for more precise details as to the interview between M. de Lamartine and the seven or eight persons with whom he concerted the plan of operations. His account of this consultation fills twelve pages; of which his own speech to them occupies eight. It was made without premeditation. It was followed by four months of incessant toil and anxiety, during which it is impossible that he could have found time to make a note of it; and the events of that period were likely to confuse or obliterate his recollection of what preceded them. We naturally wish, therefore, for the reports of some of the other interlocutors,—at all events, to know who they were. Was Marrast one of them?—Was Bastide?—Was Boccage, the actor, one?—Was Hetzel, the bookseller, one? The men who professed to hold in their hands the destinies of France, and whose pretensions excited no surprise in M. de Lamartine, could be no ordinary men. He cannot have forgotten who they were. His contemporaries may be willing to take his story upon trust; but posterity will be less indulgent; and knowing the brilliancy of his imagination, if he refuses proofs which it must be in his power to give, they may suspect that he was sometimes a poet while professing to be an historian.

With respect to the propriety, or the contrary, of M. de Lamartine's conduct on that eventful morning, we feel little doubt. If we implicitly admit his premises, indeed, he acted wisely as well as boldly. His premises are, that the Regency could not maintain itself, and that the only stable government was a Republic based on universal suffrage. Now we have already stated our belief, that until the people of France have corrected their present errors as to the proper, or rather as to the practicable, duties of government,—while they persist in thinking that its great business is to provide places and salaries for professional men, privileges and monopolies for merchants and tradesmen, and wages and employment for the labouring classes,—no stable government is possible. Every successive dynasty or assembly may fret its hour upon the stage; but it will be overturned by its disappointed friends

and by its hungry enemies. But if the claims of the Duchess of Orleans and of the Count of Paris had been as adroitly supported as those of her predecessor were,—if she had been a Louis Philippe, or had had a La Fayette, a Lafitte, and a Casimir Perrier as her seconds,—we see no reason for doubting that she and her son might have enjoyed an average period of power. During the fifty-six years between 1792 and 1848 six sovereignties occupied the throne or the chair. That of the Convention, of the Directory, of the Consulate, of Bonaparte, of the Restoration, and of 1830,—giving an average of about nine years to each. And we see no sufficient ground for doubting that the seventh might have had its nine years also.

Lamartine, to be sure, endeavours to persuade his readers, and seems to have persuaded himself, that in the beginning of 1848 an overwhelming majority of the French were republicans.

‘*Tout ce qui a le sentiment républicain dans le cœur,*’ he says, speaking in February, 1848, ‘*tout ce qui a le rêve de la république dans l’imagination, tout ce qui regrette, tout ce qui aspire, tout ce qui raisonne, tout ce qui rêve en France, républicains des sociétés secrètes, républicains militants, républicains spéculatifs, peuple, tribuns, jeunesse. écoles, journalistes, hommes de main, hommes de pensée, ne poussent qu’un cri.*’

This we utterly disbelieve. Now, indeed, after the inglorious flight of the whole royal family,—now, when among the pretenders to the throne there is not one whose ancestor has not forfeited it by the most reckless misgovernment, or by the most contemptible weakness,—now when there is not a single object of popular respect or of popular affection left standing, there is without doubt a portion of the French, comprising perhaps the majority of educated Frenchmen, who cling for the time to the republic, as the best safeguard from anarchy. But these very men, on the 24th of February, 1848, would, for the very same reasons, have clung to the regency. Emile Thomas, who had good means of judging, tells us that even on the evening of the 24th of February, 1848, there were not in Paris 10,000 avowed republicans.\* We ourselves have spent a considerable portion of the last two years in France. We have mixed with persons of every class, in the provinces as well as in Paris, and, with the exception of a few socialists, we never met with a theoretic republican,—that is to say, with any one who wished for that form of government, or even approved of it, or who did not consider the revolution of 1848 as a bitter misfortune. The *écoles* perhaps, the undisciplined youth of the Polytechnic, and

---

\* *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, p. 14.

a few dreamers like Lamartine, were honest republicans. A much greater number of ambitious demagogues, like Ledru Rollin, and of conspirators, like Caussidière and Barbès, and the general body of journalists, who live by excitement, were dishonest republicans. Others again, who usurped that title were anarchists,—who desired not the government of all, but the government of none. The rest were communists and socialists, whose object, to which they gave the name of a republic, was a class of institutions to which M. de Lamartine is quite as much opposed as Guizot or Louis Philippe could be. In fact M. de Lamartine himself, in a subsequent part of this work, confesses that he was mistaken. He tells us, that it was the unpopularity of republican institutions that decided him, at the meeting of the Assembly, to remain united to his ultra-republican associates. ‘Republican feelings,’ he then said to his friends, ‘are weak in France. They are chiefly represented by men who excite horror or terror. The Republic itself was a surprise; to which the wisdom of the Parisians (sagesse), and our moderation enabled us to give a miraculous success. But such impressions are brief. As soon as the majority of the people, which, in an enthusiasm of terror, threw itself into the hands of a moderate Republic, shall have recovered its presence of mind,—it will accuse those who have saved it, and turn on the ‘Republicans.’\* The passage which we have quoted from the first volume shows what were Lamartine’s opinions on the 24th of February; that which we now give from the second, the utter change which had taken place in them by the 4th of May. He writes, however, as if he were perfectly unconscious of inconsistency.

M. de Lamartine’s other motive, the stability of a republic, all the subsequent events have shown to be erroneous. His ‘force suprême, qui peut avoir ses agitations, jamais ses détrônements ou ses écroulements,’ his ‘gouvernement qui porte sur le fond même de la nation,’ his ‘établissement stable, national, populaire, inébranlable, enfin,’ has been the most unstable of all the governments which have succeeded its republican predecessor—the Convention. Within two days after its formation it was on the brink of ruin under an attack from the Terrorists. Three weeks later, on the 17th of March, it was saved from destruction merely by the vacillation of its enemies. A few weeks afterwards, on the 15th of April, Lamartine burnt his papers, and tells us that when he went to bed he did not expect to survive the insurrection of the next

\* Vol. ii. p. 405.

day. Again in a few weeks, on the 15th of May, there were some hours during which a new revolution was triumphant. A month later, a civil war of four days ended in a dictatorship! General Cavaignac had the moderation to resign his power after a reign of six months; but during those six months the '*établissement inébranlable*' was not merely shaken but prostrate. So little confidence is there in its present stability, that it was with great difficulty that the Assembly could be persuaded last August to adjourn for six weeks. It was seriously feared that a *coup d'état* would prevent its ever meeting again. Lamartine's theory is founded on the most dangerous of all political arguments — a metaphor. A building is firm, it is said, in proportion to the depth of the stratum on which its foundations rest. A government resting on universal suffrage may, metaphorically, be said to rest on the deepest stratum of society. But in truth such depth confers no firmness. If we too might venture to be metaphorical, we should say that the lowest stratum of society is a quicksand.

We cannot quit M. de Lamartine's history of the events which preceded the appointment of the Provisional Government without remarking that it is calculated (though, perhaps, that is too strong a word,) to give an erroneous impression as to the violence of the conflict. He admits, indeed, (p. 67.) that no blood flowed on the first day; nor does he describe any actual fighting as taking place on the second. He says, indeed, that the barricades were abandoned as soon as they were raised. The only sanguinary event of this day was the single discharge on the Boulevard des Capucins.\* During the night of the 23rd the riot, no doubt, swelled into an insurrection,—partly in consequence of the feebleness of the previous day's resistance, partly in consequence of the arrival in Paris of large bodies of Socialists and Communists, and released convicts, who had been summoned from the large provincial towns, but, above all, in consequence of the slaughter at the Boulevard des Capucins, and the use made of it by the conspirators who had planned it. 'The "bodies," says Lamartine, "were grouped upon the tombereaux,"

---

\* The 'Quarterly Review' of June, 1849, No. 169., p. 283., states that the shot from the mob which provoked this discharge was fired by Lagrange. That it was fired intentionally, and to produce the result that followed, there can, we think, be no rational doubt. The circumstance mentioned by Lamartine, that tombereaux, ready harnessed, were in waiting to receive the dead, and exhibit them in all the streets of Paris, is alone a sufficient proof. But what is the evidence, except indeed the character of the man, fixing it on Lagrange?

‘ their arms hanging over the sides of the carriages, the wounds displayed, the blood streaming over the wheels, and dragged by torch-light through the streets.’\* On the morning of the 24th a considerable body of insurgents, probably from 10,000 to 15,000, had assembled. A larger body of soldiers was arrayed, apparently to withstand them. But it was a mere appearance. They had received orders to make no resistance. A body of rioters attacked the corps de garde of the Gardes Municipaux in the Champs Elysées. They were murdered at their posts, or in the arcades of the Hôtel de la Marine, in the presence of battalions of infantry and squadrons of cavalry, who were prevented, says Lamartine, by their orders, from rescuing them.† The principal column marched on the Tuileries, sacking the Palais Royal on its way. A battalion of infantry abandoning, in obedience to the general order, the defence of the Palais Royal, took refuge in the Chateau d’Eau, immediately opposite to the gate. It was set fire to, and the wounded and prisoners whom it contained perished in the flames! ‘ All this passed,’ says M. de Lamartine, ‘ within a few steps of numerous bodies of troops, who stood motionless, petrified with astonishment, under the command of chiefs whom the king and his new minister forbade to fight.’‡ By the time this column had reached the Tuileries the royal family had fled; the troops were withdrawn, and it entered the palace without resistance. From thence it proceeded, equally unresisted, to the Chamber of Deputies, and scattered the representatives as easily as it had frightened away the monarch. This was the battle of the Revolution of 1848.

‘ Si pugna est ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum.’

But a cursory reader of Lamartine, or even an attentive one unless his attention were particularly called to the question, would suppose that the Revolution of 1848 was, like that of 1830, the result of three days’ hard fighting. He repeats, without comment, Ledru Rollin’s enormous falsehood that 3000 men had fallen.§ He speaks of the mob which entered the Chamber as ‘ inflamed by a battle of three days.’|| The weapons through which he penetrated to reach the Hôtel de Ville were brandished by arms ‘ sanglants, tremblants encore de la fièvre ‘ de trois jours de combat.’¶ The road to it is described as covered with the dead bodies of men and horses, and constantly

\* Vol. i. p. 99. † Vol. i. p. 140. ‡ Ibid. p. 142.

§ P. 200. The total loss of the Gardes Municipaux, who bore the brunt of the action, was nine men killed, and five who died of their wounds.—*Dunoyer, ‘ la Révolution du 24e Février,’* p. 10.

|| P. 211.

¶ P. 232.

crossed by litters carrying the wounded and the dead.\* All who come from the streets have their arms red with blood, and their faces blackened with powder. There is a sort of military halo of smoke and fire over all his pictures, which is not justified by the real events.

Connected with this subject is one which we approach with great pain. M. de Lamartine tells us, that the first proclamation of the Provisional Government was written by himself. It begins thus: 'A retrograde and oligarchical government has been overthrown by the heroism of the people of Paris. This government has fled, leaving behind it a trace of blood, which prohibits its return. The blood of the people has flowed as it did in July (1830),—but this time a generous people shall not be deceived.†

We are not going to blame very severely the coupling the revolution of 1830 and that of 1848; though the one was an aggression on the part of the crown, the other on the part of the people,—though Charles X. fell for having endeavoured to break the law, and Louis Philippe for having endeavoured to maintain it. Such misrepresentations are usual among great orators. But what we do blame is the wicked calumny cast on Louis Philippe of having left behind him a trace of blood. We presume that M. de Lamartine does not hold Louis Philippe responsible for the accident on the Boulevard des Capucins; and the blood that was shed elsewhere, little as it was, was nearly all of it the blood of his own servants. As well might the deaths of those who fell on the 10th of August be imputed to Louis XVI. as the deaths of those who fell on the 24th of February to Louis Philippe. It was precisely to their determination *not* to shed blood, precisely to their refusal to use their means of self-defence, that Louis XVI. sacrificed his life, and Louis Philippe his crown. And so will fall every government in Paris that suffers itself to be attacked with impunity. If Louis Philippe had acted in 1848 as he did in 1832 and 1834, the *émeute* of the 24th of February would by this time have been forgotten. We have often lamented that a man like M. de Lamartine should have *signed* a paper containing a false and cruel accusation of a fallen man. We should not have believed on any evidence but his own that he had actually *written* it.

The picture of the first day of the Provisional Government is

---

\* P. 230.

† We translate the official document, which differs a little from M. de Lamartine's version.

wonderfully vivid. It places in the brightest light the courage, self-devotion, and eloquence of M. de Lamartine. We are not inclined, however, to make any extracts from it. The constant representation of mental and bodily struggle becomes at length fatiguing even to the reader. We prefer the repose of a night scene: — and we will give it in the original.

‘Lamartine sortit à minuit de l’Hôtel de Ville. La nuit était orageuse et sombre. Le vent pluvieux chassait les nuées basses dans le ciel, les fumées rampantes des lampions allumés sur la crête des barricades, et faisait gémir sur les toits les girouettes et les bouches de fer des cheminées. A l’entrée de toutes les rues des factionnaires volontaires du peuple veillaient, le fusil chargé à la main, sans autre consigne que leur zèle. De distance en distance on trouvait de grands feux allumés, autour desquels bivouaquaient sur un peu de paille des groupes de combattants endormis. De temps en temps seulement on entendait de rares détonations, et des balles sifflaient de loin en loin dans l’air. C’étaient des postes de combattants, qui tiraient au hasard, pour avertir les troupes dont on ignorait les dispositions, que l’armée du peuple était debout.

‘Après avoir changé ses vêtements, mis en lambeaux par les tumultes de la journée, et pris deux ou trois heures de sommeil, il repartit à pied à quatre heures du matin, pour l’Hôtel de Ville.

‘Les heures tardives de la nuit avaient assoupi plus complètement la ville. Les feux s’éteignaient sur les barricades. Les factionnaires du peuple dormaient — le coude appuyé sur la bouche de canon de leurs fusils. On entendait une certaine rumeur sourde sortant des rues profondes et noires qui entourent la Place de Grève ; des groupes de quatre ou cinq hommes armés traversaient çà et là le quai, les rues, les places, d’un pas précipité. Ils s’entretenaient à voix basse en marchant, comme des conjurés. Ces hommes étaient en général autrement vêtus que le reste du peuple. Des redingotes de couleur sombre, des casquettes de drap noir à passe-poil rouge, des pantalons et des bottes d’une certaine élégance, des barbes touffues sur le menton et sur les lèvres, soigneusement coupées et peignées, des mains délicates et blanches, plus faites pour tenir la plume que l’outil, des regards intelligents mais soupçonneux et ardents comme le complot, attestaient que ces hommes n’appartenaient pas, par leurs travaux du moins, aux classes prolétaires, — mais qu’ils en étaient les meneurs, les agitateurs et les chefs. Lamartine put apercevoir à la lueur des feux de bivouac, qu’ils portaient des rubans rouges à leur boutonnière et des cocardes rouges à leur chapeau. Il crut que c’était un simple signe de ralliement, arboré pour se reconnaître entre eux, pendant les jours de combat qui venaient de s’écouler. Il entra sans soupçon à l’Hôtel de Ville, et releva son collègue Marie, qui alla à son tour, voir et rassurer les siens.

‘Le calme, le silence, et le sommeil régnaient à cette heure dans toutes les parties de ce vaste édifice, si tumultueux quelques heures avant. Lamartine reprit son poste dans l’enceinte, un peu élargie, à moitié évacuée et mieux protégée du gouvernement provisoire. Il y



attendit, en rédigeant des ordres et en préparant des décrets, la renaissance du jour et le retour de quelques-uns de ses collègues.\*

The appearance of the small bodies of men distinguished by red symbols, whom M. de Lamartine so well describes, was an event of great importance. It marked the formation, out of several elements, of a party which has menaced from that day the institutions which the Provisional Government and the Constituent Assembly have endeavoured to give to France, — has four or five times been on the point of overthrowing them, — has once occasioned them to be suspended for six months, — and is destined, we believe, ultimately to destroy them, not indeed by substituting its own schemes, but by frightening the higher classes into some form in which the monarchical element shall be even more preponderant than it now is, — we mean, of course, the terrorist party — the Red Republicans.

M. de Lamartine gives two somewhat different descriptions of the class who constituted the leaders and the nucleus of the proper ultra-revolutionary party. He first describes it as consisting of those to whom the object of a revolution is the madness of the revolution itself — of men with no desires of progress, no visions of political improvement, free from the chimeras of those who think that the social edifice can be reconstructed without burying a generation under its ruins, and from the theories of those who look on governments as the instruments of public welfare. 'Such men,' he says, 'without faith, and without principle, but full of passions and of violence, wish for a state of society as violent as themselves. Their theory of government is a prolonged revolution; — without morality, without law, without peace, and without end.'†

He subsequently describes the Terrorists as the produce of the revolutionary literature which flourished during the Restoration and under Louis Philippe; which repeated in cold blood the ferocities of Danton and the maxims of St. Just, which looked with pity on all who scrupled to attribute to the public men of a revolution a right to proscribe and destroy their enemies and their rivals — and reversed the ordinary judgment of history, by heaping honour on the destroyers and contempt on the victims. In the nomenclature of this literature, the Republic meant the violent triumph of a party over the nation — the substitution of tyranny from below for tyranny from above, its arbitrary will for law, anger for justice, and the scaffold for government.‡

'The believers in this creed,' he says, 'were generally young men,

\* Vol. i. p. 320.

† Vol. i. p. 326.

‡ Vol. i. p. 338, 339.

blanched in the shade of secret societies, their minds poisoned from infancy by the classics of the Reign of Terror, accustomed to dally with Danton for his audacity in murder, and St. Just for his insensibility, — ascribing grandeur to crimes that were merely enormous, — irritated by the want of sympathy, and ready to buy notoriety at any price ; — men whose sleep was disturbed by their envy of the immortality of Marat and Babeuf.\*

Such, according to Lamartine, were the chiefs of the Terrorist party. The subordinate members—the rank and file of the revolutionary army—he divides into three classes. First he places the dregs of society,—the outcasts from civilised life, who infest every large town. Among these are the liberated convicts, who pass their time between crime and imprisonment ; those who live by the expedients of the day, — many by practices more shameful than crime itself ; those who, having lost by misconduct the means of an honest livelihood, keep up a permanent warfare against law and order, — who think vice a profession, and crime a glory ; and, lastly, those who, in his words, to all of which we cannot attach a definite meaning, (probably because the animal described is peculiar to France,) ‘ ont en eux-mêmes le vertige continu du désordre, le souffle sans repos de l’agitation, la volupté du chaos, la soif du sang.’† This class of ruffians he estimates at 20,000. Next he puts the Communists, — the systematic enemies of rent, of profit, of wages, of inheritance, of capital, of property, — in short, of all the results of civilisation. To these he adds, as the third element, the mere ignorant, indigent population of Paris, thrown out of work by three days of tumult, — ready to believe any statements and to trust to any promises, however monstrous, and to follow any leaders, whatever might be their course.

Such is M. de Lamartine’s description of the party which assumed the red flag as their standard. He denies that, at the commencement of this revolution, the Socialists, as distinguished from the Communists, sympathised with the Terrorist party. Their schemes, however impracticable and absurd, were not then tainted by violence. Firmly convinced of the truth of their theories, they believed that, if once their plans could be put into action, even on a small scale, the prosperity and happiness which they would diffuse would lead to their universal and voluntary adoption.

‘ At this time,’ he says, ‘ a sincere and religious enthusiasm raised both the masters and the disciples of the different sects of Socialists above the evil desires, the low ambition, and the ferocity which have

---

\* Vol. i. p. 343.

---

† Vol. i. p. 346.

since been imputed to them. Enthusiasm purifies the heart. That of the Socialists, especially of the followers of Fourier and Raspail, amounted almost to ecstasy. The crust which confined the old world seemed suddenly broken up for them. They hoped to mould the new one in accordance with their theories; and to cover it with their phalansteres, — a sort of manufacturing and agricultural convents, — which might succeed if they were peopled by angels and managed by Gods! Their delightful anticipations filled them with kindness. The sentiments with which their hearts overflowed were humane and fraternal. They wished to respect all vested rights, to remedy all social injustice, to protect the rich, and to relieve the poor. They offered to the government their assistance, their influence, their bayonets and their blood, to aid it in the maintenance of order and the protection of property. They wished for changes, but they wished them to be gradual and peaceful.\*

We shall see that the Socialists did not long retain their fidelity to the moderate Republic. But, even without their assistance, — even in spite of their opposition, — the Red party was, on the 25th of February, very formidable. M. de Lamartine estimates (p. 359.) the number of those who made the first rush on the Hôtel de Ville, at between thirty and forty thousand; and the number who, later in the day, filled the Place de Grève and the courts of the building he supposes (p. 386.) to have been from sixty to eighty thousand. If these estimates are tolerable approximations, the Red party, up to the end of the day, formed one half of those present, and, in the morning, were an overwhelming majority; while the Provisional Government had absolutely no force to oppose to it. Their second proclamation the day before, had in fact, for the time, destroyed the National Guard, by declaring that all the citizens made a part of it. The greater part of the regular troops had retired from Paris; and those who remained could not be relied on, in opposition to what seemed now to be the supreme authority, — any crowd calling itself the people. The Garde Mobile — the happiest of Lamartine's creations — did not yet exist. The means of resistance then, possessed by the government were merely eloquence, reason, and authority; and the vigour, the courage, the perseverance, and ultimately the success, with which they were employed, have shed a lustre on this day of M. de Lamartine's life, which no other portion of his career, brilliant as it has been, has obtained. We ascribe the honours of this day to M. de Lamartine; because none of his colleagues have claimed much share in them. Dupont de l'Eure, Arago, and Ledru Rollin were absent during the struggle. Lamartine

---

\* Vol. i. p. 334.

bears his testimony to the exertions of Marie, Crémieux, Garnier Pagès, and Marrast; but no trace has been preserved of them. Flocon was employed at Vincennes; and Louis Blanc and Albert sympathised—the former partially, the second entirely—with the enemy.

The public is familiar with the general outline of these events. Lamartine's contrast between the red flag—which never went further than round the Champ de Mars, dragged through the blood of the people—and the tricolor, which had gone round the world—carrying with it the name, the glory, and the liberty of France—is classical throughout Europe. The further details which he has now given to us are as graphic and picturesque as it is possible for a narrative to be. Such, for instance, is the description (p. 356.) of the sudden appearance before the Hôtel de Ville of the red colour of the party,—of the manner in which the government whom it menaced saw it run through rank and rank of the crowd in the Place de Grève, and along the Quays—and blaze from the opposite windows and roofs! Such too, is his description of the communist delegate who first penetrated into the room occupied by the Provisional Government, and bore to them the ultimatum of the people. It would be rash to translate it:—

‘C’était un homme de vingt ou vingt-cinq ans, de stature moyenne mais droite, forte, d’un ferme et robuste aplomb sur ses membres; son visage noirci par la fumée de la poudre était pâle d’émotion, ses lèvres tremblaient de colère, ses yeux enfoncés sous un front proéminent, lançaient du feu,—électricité du peuple concentrée dans un regard! Sa physionomie avait à la fois le caractère de la réflexion et de l’égarement—contraste étrange qui se retrouve sur certains visages où une pensée fautive est devenue néanmoins une conviction sincère, et une obstination à l’impossible. Il roulait dans sa main gauche un lambeau de ruban ou d’étoffe rouge; il tenait de la main droite le canon d’une carabine, dont il faisait à chaque mot résonner la crosse sur le parquet; il paraissait à la fois intimidé et résolu. On voyait qu’il se raffermissait lui-même contre toute faiblesse et toute transaction, par un parti fortement arrêté d’avance; il semblait sentir et entendre derrière lui le peuple immense et furieux; dont il était l’organe, qui l’écoutait, et qui allait lui demander compte de ses paroles.

‘Il roulait ses regards dans le vide autour de la salle; il ne les arrêtait sur aucun visage, de peur de rencontrer un autre regard et d’être involontairement influencé; il secouait perpétuellement la tête de gauche à droite et de droite à gauche, comme s’il eût réfuté en lui-même des objections qu’on lui aurait faites. C’était le buste de l’obstination, le dernier mot incarné d’une multitude qui sent sa force et qui ne veut plus rien céder à la raison.

‘Il parlait avec cette éloquence rude, brutale, sans réplique, qui

ne discute pas, mais qui commande. Sa langue fiévreuse se collait sur ses lèvres sèches, il avait ces balbutiements terribles qui irritent et qui redoublent dans l'homme inculte la colère de l'émotion contenue, par l'impuissance même d'articuler sa fureur; ses gestes achevaient ses mots. Tout le monde fut debout et silencieux pour l'écouter.

'Il parla non en homme, mais en peuple qui veut être obéi, et qui ne sait pas attendre; il mesura les heures et les minutes à la docilité du gouvernement; il lui commanda des miracles; il répéta en les accentuant avec plus d'énergie toutes les conditions du programme de l'impossible, que les vociférations tumultueuses du peuple enjoignaient d'accepter et de réaliser à l'instant,—le renversement de toute sociabilité connue, l'extermination de la propriété, des capitalistes,—la spoliation, l'installation immédiate du prolétaire dans la communauté des biens, la proscription des banquiers, des riches, des fabricants, des bourgeois de toute condition supérieurs aux salariés, un gouvernement la hache à la main pour niveler toutes les suprématies de la naissance, de l'aisance, de l'hérédité, du travail même; enfin, l'acceptation sans réplique et sans délai du drapeau rouge, pour signifier à la société sa défaite, au peuple sa victoire, à Paris la terreur, à tous les gouvernements étrangers l'invasion. Chacune de ces injonctions était appuyée par l'orateur d'un coup de crosse de fusil sur le plancher, d'une acclamation frénétique de ceux qui étaient derrière lui, d'une salve de coups de feu tirés sur la place.'\*

We had believed that the victory was gained by Lamartine's celebrated comparison of the fortunes of the red flag and the tricolor; but we now find that this was only an incident in the struggle. The mob to which it had been addressed was pouring back with shouts of 'Vive Lamartine!' 'Vive le drapeau tricolor!' when it was met, repulsed, and passed through by a body of revolutionists more fierce and more implacable than any of the previous columns. 'A bas Lamartine!' 'Mort à Lamartine!' they screamed! 'point de paroles, le décret, le décret! ou le gouvernement des traîtres à la lanterne!' Lamartine had placed himself before the great gate, raised on a chair above the small knot of devoted adherents who stood between him and a band of ruffians whose bayonets and swords almost reached his body, and, indeed, slightly wounded one of his hands. His voice could not now be heard in the tumult: He would not retreat; yet, if he remained, the only result seemed to be, his being thrown down and trampled to death by the mob.

He was saved, as in no other place in Europe he could have been saved, by a beggar, who rushed between him and his assailants, invoked him as the brother, the father, the god of the people; embraced him, kissed him, and at length obtained for him, all that was necessary to his triumph—a hearing. For

---

\* Vol. i. p. 376.

whenever a Parisian mob hears Lamartine it is subjugated. He subdued this last detachment of the Red party as he had subdued its predecessors: The tricolor was raised again over the great gates; the mob dispersed, and after eight hours of struggle the Place de Grève was again empty. The contest had left the members of the government in a state of mind which M. de Lamartine thinks peculiarly favourable to wise legislation.

‘Tout,’ he says, ‘était de nature à susciter dans l’âme ces grandes pensées qui jaillissent du cœur, et qui sont la souveraine politique—parcequ’elles sont la souveraine nature et la souveraine vérité. L’instinct est le suprême législateur, celui qui l’écrit en loi, écrit sous la dictée de Dieu.

‘Every member of the council sought, in the depths of his heart and of his intellect, for some great reform, some great legislative, political, or moral improvement.

‘Some proposed the instantaneous abolition of negro slavery.

‘Others, the abolition of the restrictions imposed by the laws of September upon the press.

‘Some, the proclamation of fraternity among nations, in order to abolish war by abolishing conquest.

‘Some, the abolition of the qualification of electors.

‘And all, the principles of mutual charity among all classes of citizens.

‘As quickly as these great democratic truths, rather felt than discussed, were converted into decrees, they were printed in a press set up at the door of the council-room, thrown from the windows to the crowd, and despatched by couriers through the departments! A whole century, to which the revolution had restored speech, suddenly raised its voice; and poured forth all the christian, and philosophical, and democratic truths which had slumbered for fifty years in the meditations of the wise, and in the vague desires of the nation. But the experience of those fifty years had also ripened the intellect of the country, and of the men whose decrees were proclaimed in its name. That experience sat with Dupont de l’Eure, Arago, Marie, and Carnot, at the table where these truths became realities. And it is remarkable, that at this meeting, so inspired and so fruitful, not one instance of rashness or of exaggeration tainted the acts or the words of this government of enthusiasm. Not one of these legislators had afterwards to efface one of the engagements which he now made to the country and to posterity. Every one of these decrees passed as a law into the hands of the National Assembly.’\*

It is remarkable that the proclamation of fraternity among nations and of the abolition of war and conquest, does not appear among the printed acts of the Provisional Government. The invasion of a friendly state, and the siege and occupation of its

capital, 'in order to maintain the proper influence of France in Italy,' is a curious comment on it. It is also to be observed that the decree containing the abolition of the electoral qualification bears date the 4th of March; that repealing the restrictions on the press, the 6th of March; and the decrees relating to the abolition of slavery in the French colonies, the 4th of March and the 27th of April; and therefore are not among the 'grandes vérités démocratiques,' which were converted into decrees in this 'séance inspirée et féconde.' The important decrees, which actually bear date the 25th or the 26th of February, and which may therefore be referred to this evening of instinct, inspiration, and enthusiasm, are these: —

The 18th, which sets at liberty all persons detained on political grounds.

The 19th, by which the government —

1. Engages to secure the existence of the operative (*ouvrier*) by employment.

2. Engages to secure employment (*garantir du travail*) to all citizens.

3. Admits that operatives ought to combine in order to enjoy the fruits of their labour.

4. And promises to return to the operatives, whose property it is, the million which will fall in from the civil list.

The 22d, which dissolves the Municipal Guards.

The 26th, which declares that the actual government of France is Republican, and that the nation will immediately be called on to ratify by its votes this resolution of the government and of the people of Paris.

The 29th, which declares — That royalty, under any name whatever, Legitimacy, Bonapartism, or Regency, is abolished; and that the government has taken all the steps necessary to render impossible the return of the former dynasty or the accession of a new one;

And the 30th, which directs the immediate establishment of national workshops (*ateliers nationaux*).\*

We confess that we agree with Lamartine in thinking that they bear the stamp of instinct much more than that of reason.

The liberation of all political offenders, and the dissolution of the Municipal Guard, were united by a *curiosa infelicitas*. One set free a set of conspirators, who very soon did their utmost to destroy the government that had released them; and the other

---

\* We extract these decrees from the 'Recueil complet des Actes du Gouvernement Provisoire.' Paris: 1848.

deprived Paris, when it most wanted protection, of the only police which it possessed. The cruelty with which this admirable body of men, whose crime was that they had for many years protected the persons and property of the Parisians, were left utterly unprovided for, is a disgraceful part of the history of the Provisional Government. It was an unmanly concession to the worst feelings of the worst part of the populace.\*

The declaration that the actual government of France was republican, is defended by Lamartine on the ground that the Provisional Government had only three courses to take—to proclaim no form of government, which would have been anarchy; to proclaim monarchy, which would have been civil war; or to proclaim a republic. Now the first answer to this is, that the declaration ‘*que le gouvernement actuel de la France est le ‘gouvernement républicain,’*’ was palpably untrue. The actual government of France at that time was as far removed from republicanism as it was possible for a government to be. It was a many-headed Dictatorship—a Despotic oligarchy. Eleven men, some appointed in the offices of a newspaper, and the others by a mob which had broken into the Chamber of Deputies, ruled France during three months, with an absoluteness of which there is no other example in history. The most tyrannical Asiatic or African monarch, the emperor of China, the king of Dahoni or of the Ashantees, could not venture on one tenth of the arbitrary acts which they crowded into their hundred days. They dissolved the Chamber of Deputies; they forbade the peers to meet; they added 200,000 men to the regular army, and raised a new metropolitan army of 20,000 more, at double the ordinary pay; to meet this expense they added 41 per cent. to the direct taxes; they restricted the bank from cash payments; they made its paper a legal tender, and then required it to lend them fifty millions; they broke the public faith with the depositors in savings’ banks; they abolished old taxes and enacted new ones; they declared

---

\* Their story is well told by M. Emile Thomas. He thus describes their state when they applied to him, as director of the *ateliers nationaux*, for relief:—‘*Ils avaient tout perdu dans l’incendie de leurs casernes; ils venaient, presque en haillons, tremblants, affamés, s’exposer, dans les rangs des ouvriers, aux insultes, et aux menaces, qui ne leur faisaient pas faute, pour obtenir les secours offerts à tous.*’

‘*La Gouvernement Provisoire avait eu la cruauté de les repousser, de briser leur carrière, signalée par de longs et d’honorables services, et de les laisser en proie à la misère la plus affreuse.*’—*Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, p. 128.

General Cavaignac had the courage to recal them to the service of the public. It was one of the first measures of his dictatorship.



at an end the treaties which form the base of the international law of Europe; they dismissed judicial officers who by law were irremovable; they sent commissioners through the country invested with powers as absolute as those which they had assumed themselves; they altered the hours of labour throughout France, and subjected to heavy fines any master who should allow his operatives to remain at work for the old accustomed period: They behaved, in short, in a manner in which no government could behave, except one that was restrained by no opposing or moderating force, and in which a government so perfectly unrestrained might perhaps be expected to behave. And this state of things they describe by saying that 'the actual government of France is republican.' If this be a sample of republican government, we far prefer to it a Turkish despotism or even a Venetian aristocracy.

It is probable, however, that the first of these decrees is not to be understood according to the apparent import of its words. It is probable that, instead of a statement of fact, it is a declaration of will—that the word actual means future; and that what was intended to be announced was, that the Provisional Government had decided that the government which was to succeed their dictatorship should be republican. This may have been a wise decision; but it was one not merely beyond the competence of a provisional government, according to all ordinary notions as to the functions of such a power, but peculiarly beyond the competence of the Provisional Government which was sitting on the 25th of February, 1848. That government had been created on the express condition that it 'ne préjugerait rien sur la nature du gouvernement qu'il plairait à la nation de se donner, quand elle serait interrogée.' Lamartine himself tells us that there was a burst of applause when, on first proposing a provisional government, he made this reserve of the rights of the nation. The next day, however, if this be the meaning of the decree, this reserve was forgotten; nor is it of any consequence that this declaration was made subject to the ratification of the future Assembly. Every law that is passed by one government is of course liable to be altered by another. England is now a monarchy; but subject to the power of Parliament, to change it, in the next session, into a democracy or an oligarchy.

All doubts, however, as to the meaning of the 26th decree are removed by the 30th, — which absolutely abolishes Royalty, and announces that the Provisional Government has taken all the measures necessary to render impossible the return of the former or the accession of a new dynasty. Thus the government which was

to prejudge nothing, takes all the measures necessary to render impossible a return to the institutions under which, with the exception of the seven most miserable years that she ever endured, France had lived ever since the times of Cæsar.

We do not attach, however, much importance to these two decrees. Great as was the power of the Provisional Government, *it could not* render impossible either the return of the old dynasty or the accession of a new one: it could not prevent the French nation from re-establishing Monarchy if it should so think fit. And in fact, not four months afterwards, Monarchy — real, though temporary — was re-established in the person of General Cavaignac. And under the existing constitution, the monarchical element is stronger in France than in almost any part of Europe. Louis Napoleon has more real power than any of his contemporary sovereigns, except the Czar. We are writing in October. Perhaps by the time that these pages are before the public the revolution will have passed into a new phase. But at this instant the French are more the subjects of a single will, — uncontrolled, and, within very large limits and for several years, legally uncontrollable, by the people or by its representatives, — than they have been under any king since the death of Louis XIV., — than they were during the times when their king was most autocratic, during the early part of the reign of Louis XVIII. and the latter part of that of Louis Philippe.

The 19th and 30th decrees — the universal guarantee of employment by the former, and the creation of *ateliers nationaux* by the latter, — were less palpably absurd, but more extensively, and, we fear, more permanently, mischievous. The engagement to secure employment to all citizens is, when all which it necessarily implies is expressed, an engagement to supply to all applicants materials, tools, and — until those materials have been worked up, sold, and paid for — subsistence. Or, in other words, to provide every applicant with capital: and when he has lost it, or destroyed it, to give him fresh supplies: to take the property of the rich — that is to say, the fruits of industry, abstinence, and skill, and transfer it to the poor — that is to say, to those who, by idleness, or vice, or imprudence, or the ill luck which is the result of unobserved defects of character, have been deprived of wealth, or have been unable to acquire it. To produce equality, but certainly not equality of happiness.

M. de Lamartine, as we have seen, looks on socialists with pity, and on communists with horror; but M. de Tocqueville, in his great speech on the *droit au travail*, clearly showed that, if enforced, these decrees must end in the one or the other. ‘If the ‘State,’ says M. de Tocqueville, ‘attempts to fulfil its engagement

‘ by itself giving work, it becomes itself a great employer of labour.  
 ‘ As it is the only capitalist that cannot refuse employment, and  
 ‘ as it is the capitalist whose workpeople are always the most  
 ‘ lightly tasked, it will soon become the greatest, and soon after  
 ‘ the only, great employer. The public revenue, instead of  
 ‘ merely supporting the Government, will have to support all  
 ‘ the industry of the country. As rents and profits are swallowed  
 ‘ up by taxes, private property, now become a mere incum-  
 ‘ brance, will be abandoned to the State; and, subject to the  
 ‘ duty of maintaining the people, the Government will be the  
 ‘ only proprietor. This is Communism.

‘ If, on the other hand, the State, in order to escape from this  
 ‘ train of consequences, does not itself find work, but takes care  
 ‘ that it shall always be supplied by individual capitalists, it must  
 ‘ take care that at no place and at no time there be a stagnation.  
 ‘ It must take on itself the management of both capitalists and  
 ‘ labourers. It must see that the one class do not injure one  
 ‘ another by over trading, or the other by competition. It must  
 ‘ regulate profits and wages—sometimes retard, sometimes ac-  
 ‘ celerate, production or consumption. In short, in the jargon  
 ‘ of the school, it must organise industry. This is Socialism.’\*

The necessary consequence of the 19th decree, promising employment to all applicants, was the creation of the *ateliers nationaux* by the 30th. These workshops were immediately opened in the outskirts of Paris. A person who wished to take advantage of the offers of the Government, took from the person with whom he lodged a certificate that he was an inhabitant of the *Département de la Seine*. This certificate he carried to the *mairie* of his *arrondissement*, and obtained an order of admission to an *atelier*. If he was received and employed there, he obtained an order on his *mairie* for forty sous. If he was not received, after having applied at all of them, and found them all full, he received an order for thirty sous.† Thirty sous is not high pay; but it was to be had for doing nothing; and hopes of advancement were held out. Every body of eleven persons formed an *escouade*; and their head, the *escouadier*, elected by his companions, got half a franc a day extra. Five *escouades* formed a *brigade*; and the *brigadier*, also elected by his subordinates, received three francs a day. Above these again were the *lieutenants*, the *chefs de compagnie*, the *chefs de service*, and the *chefs d'arrondissement*, appointed by the Government, and receiving progressively higher salaries.‡

---

\* Séance du 11e Sept. 1848. Assemblée Constituante.

† *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, par Emile Thomas, p. 80.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 58.

Besides this, bread was distributed to their families in proportion to the number of children.\*

The hours supposed to be employed in labour were nine and a half.† We say *supposed* to be employed, because all eleemosynary employment, all relief work, all parish work, (to use expressions which have become classical in Ireland and in England,) is in fact nominal. When the relations of the labourer and the capitalist are in the state which in a highly civilised society may be called natural, since it is the form which, in such a society, they naturally tend to assume, when undistorted by mischievous legislation, the diligence of the labourer is their necessary result. As he is paid only in proportion to his services, he strives to make those services as valuable as he can. His exertions perhaps ought more frequently to be moderated than to be stimulated. A large proportion of our best artisans wear themselves out prematurely. In another state of society, which is also natural in a lower civilisation, — that of slavery, a smaller, but still a considerable amount of industry is enforced, by punishment. But in eleemosynary employment there is absolutely no motive for the labourer to make any exertion, or for the employer, a mere public officer, to enforce it. The labourer is, at all events, to have subsistence for himself and his family. To give him more, would immediately attract to the public paymaster all the labourers of the country; to give him less, and yet require his services, would be both cruelty and fraud. He cannot be discharged, — he cannot be flogged, — he cannot be put to task work, — since to apportion the tasks to the various powers of individuals would require a degree of zealous and minute superintendence which no public officer ever gave. When the attempt was made in Paris, men accustomed to the work earned fifteen francs a-day, those unaccustomed to it, not one.

This semi-military organisation, regular payment, and nominal work, produced results which we cannot suppose to have been unexpected by the Government. M. Emile Thomas tells us that in one mairie, that containing the Faubourg St. Antoine, a mere supplemental bureau enrolled from the 12th to the 20th of March more than 1,000 new applicants every day.‡ We have before us a list of those who had been enrolled on the 19th of May: and it amounts to 87,942.§ A month later it amounted to 125,000, — representing, at 4 to a family, 600,000 persons; — more than one half of the population of Paris.

To suppose that such an army as this could be regularly

\* Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux, p. 67.

† Ibid. p. 70.

‡ Ibid. p. 172.

§ Ibid. p. 376.

organised, fed, and paid, for months in idleness, and then quietly disbanded, was a folly of which the Provisional Government was not long guilty. They soon saw that the monster which they had created could not be subdued, if it could be subdued at all, by any means short of civil war.

‘Do you wish to know,’ says Lamartine in his “*Conseiller du Peuple*” of October, 1849, ‘why some of us consented to retain power after the meeting of the Constituent Assembly? This is the answer: It was because we saw the inevitable approach of a battle with the *ateliers nationaux*! and we thought it our duty to cover the Assembly, at least during that battle, with our breasts and our popularity.’

Nearly a similar statement is to be found in the work which we are reviewing.

‘A thunder-cloud,’ says M. de Lamartine, ‘was always before our eyes. It was formed by the *ateliers nationaux*. This army of 120,000 workpeople, the greater part of whom were idlers and agitators, was the deposit of the misery, the laziness, the vagrancy, the vice, and the sedition which the flood of the revolution had cast up and left on its shores. The Provisional Government had created these *ateliers* as a means of temporary relief, to prevent the unemployed workpeople from plundering the rich, or dying of hunger,—but they never concealed from themselves, that the day when this mass of *imperious idlers* was to be broken up, scattered over the country, and employed in real work, must bring a change, which could not be effected without resistance, without a conflict, without a formidable sedition.’\*

M. de Lamartine’s justification of a measure which assembled and disciplined in Paris an army of 120,000 enemies is, as we have seen, sheer necessity. Trade and manufactures were stopped by the revolution, and Paris was in danger of being sacked. Paris, however, has passed through many revolutions, without *ateliers nationaux*, and without being plundered. Without doubt the course that the revolution of 1848, under Lamartine’s guidance, had taken, the instant subversion which he encouraged of royalty, and the promise which he made of pure democracy, had spread an unusual amount of terror among capitalists. There was probably greater alarm, and therefore greater want of employment, than in 1830. It may have been consequently necessary to provide relief on a larger scale; but we firmly believe that such relief might have been given by means comparatively innocuous. It was not the 20th decree, creating the *ateliers nationaux*, which occasioned the rebellion of June. It was the 19th, — that which guaranteed employment to every citizen, and recognised the right of workpeople to combine. Had not that decree been issued, relief to

the unemployed would have been given, *as* relief. It might have been subjected to conditions to which none but the destitute would have submitted; and, though subject to these conditions, if tendered as charity, it would have been accepted with gratitude. But the 19th decree converted it into a debt: and the first consequence was to deprive the Government of all power of selection. Lamartine tells us that the greater part of the applicants were idlers and agitators; that the *ateliers* became deposits of laziness, vagrancy, vice, and sedition. Under the 19th decree this was inevitable. The decree guaranteed employment — not to the diligent or to the well-disposed, but to all. Now, to guarantee *subsistence* to all,—to proclaim that no man, whatever be his vices or even his crimes, shall die of hunger or cold,—is a promise that in the state of civilisation of England, or of France, can be performed not merely with safety, but with advantage; because the gift of mere subsistence may be subjected to conditions which no one will voluntarily accept: But *employment* cannot safely be made degrading, and cannot practically be made severe.

The latter part of the decree, which was a public encouragement of combinations, aided by the 42nd decree, published three days after, which proclaimed that the revolution had been made by the people and for the people, and that it was time to put an end to the long and unjust sufferings of the labouring population, of course produced an immediate crop of combinations. They followed their accustomed tactics,—the unions of the different trades appointed committees, the committees ordered strikes, and the *ateliers nationaux* enabled those orders to be carried into execution.

‘Les différens comités,’ says Carlier, Directeur de la Police, ‘ont obtenu *par intimidation* la cessation des travaux dans les ateliers des fabricants, et ont rejeté les ouvriers dans les ateliers nationaux.’\*

The workpeople were told, you may fold your arms; the Government cannot starve you; you will have it all your own way. Quit your masters, or ask wages that will force them to discharge you; their establishments must be closed, the Government will take possession of them, and hand them over to you.†

As they were managed, the *ateliers nationaux*, it is now admitted, produced or aggravated the very evils which they professed to cure or to palliate. They produced or continued the stagnation of business which they were to remedy; and, when they

\* Enquête sur l'Insurrection du 23e Juin et 15e Mai, tome ii. p. 16.

† See the evidence of M. Goudchaux; ‘Enquête,’ tome ii. p. 290.

became absolutely intolerable, the attempt to put an end to them occasioned the civil war which they were to prevent. When men to whom employment had been guaranteed—men ‘whose long and unjust sufferings were now to be terminated,’—men ‘by whom and for whom the revolution had been made,’ were told that all from seventeen to twenty-five years old must enter the army, that the rest must accept whatever employment, and on whatever terms, private individuals offered them, or the Government imposed on them, and that all who refused compliance would be dismissed\*, they resisted, as Lamartine foresaw that they would do. They took to their arms—not without some pretence of justice; and no one who was at Paris during the four dreadful days of June, 1848, can say, that on the first, or the second, or even the third day, the contest was not doubtful.

Had it not been for their subsequent ratification by M. de Lamartine, we should not have dwelt on the decrees of the 25th and 26th of February. They were the work of men of no administrative experience; with little mutual acquaintance,—in fact, separated from one another by the widest distinctions of birth, of education, of habits, of feelings, and of opinions,—thrown suddenly into power by events which even those who planned them did not expect, sitting in the face of a mob whose wild passions no one could foresee, and no power at their command could control. That their decrees and proclamations should be such as, in fact, we find them, was to be expected: And if M. de Lamartine had only cast over them a decent veil, we should not have thought it worth while to lift it. But by deliberately adopting them, more than a year after, in the calmness of seclusion,—by affirming their absolute exemption from rashness and error,—by almost hinting that they were the result of inspiration, he has given to them a place among the elements from which we must estimate his political character.

It was not until the sixth evening that Lamartine could turn his attention to his own department—foreign affairs, and take possession of the hotel on the ill-omened Boulevard des Capucins:—

‘They opened,’ he says, ‘to the new minister the apartments of M. Guizot. To him they seemed still tenanted by his shade. The room, the bed, the tables still scattered over with papers, in the state in which the supporter of the monarchy had left them on the night of the 23rd, showed the sudden departure of a minister who thought that he had left his home for an instant,—and had left it for ever! A woman, in M. Guizot’s confidence, accompanied him. Lamartine placed in her hands the private documents and the few movables which belonged

---

\* See a note of these Orders; ‘*Enquête*,’ tome ii. p. 161.

to his predecessor; and left an apartment which seemed to bring no good fortune to its inhabitant. He desired his mattress to be spread in the naked rooms of the ground floor, more gloomy in themselves, but less so in their associations.\*

We have ourselves received M. Guizot's testimony to the perfect good faith with which all his private papers were delivered to him, un mutilated and unexamined,—preserved by M. de Lamartine not only from plunder, but from curiosity.

Lamartine tells us that he passed the night in reflections on the foreign policy of France. He has generally been considered a pacific foreign minister. It is true that, as he tells us in this history, and in his 'Conseiller du Peuple' of last June, he believed that war in 1848 would have been fatal to the Moderate Republican party. He saw that war, successful or unsuccessful, would lead to increased expenditure and diminished income, double taxation, forced loans, national bankruptcy, inconvertible paper currency, destruction of manufactures, suspension of commerce, insurrection of workmen, the emigration of the rich, the rage of the poor, and a reign of terror, which by the copious use of its own powerful instruments, might be prolonged indefinitely. He laboured therefore anxiously to preserve peace, at that particular period. But we are constrained to say that the general tendency of his political feelings is not pacific; for it is ambitious; and ambition is always warlike—especially in France. One of his complaints against Louis Philippe is, that France under his government could not increase her territory. In his general view of the policy which France ought to adopt, he proposes only two courses,—*each of them involving war for the purpose of conquest*; and decides in favour of the most violent, the most unprincipled, and the most ambitious:—

'The treaties of 1815,' he says, 'drove back France into limits too narrow for her vanity and for her activity. They left her without an ally, and therefore restless and suspicious. There were two modes by which we might have reconstructed our alliances, and established a French system on the Continent and on the ocean. One was to ally ourselves with Germany, against Russia and England—the other, to ally ourselves with Russia, against Austria and England. In the former case, we *might extend our territory* in Savoy, in Switzerland, and in the Prussian provinces on the Rhine—by granting to Austria an extension in Italy, on the Lower Danube and on the Adriatic. If we adopt the second alternative, we may stifle Austria between ourselves and Russia; *extend ourselves freely over Italy, repossess ourselves of Belgium and of the Rhine, and reassume our influence over Spain*. Granting Constantinople, the Black Sea, the Dardanelles,



and the Adriatic to Russia, would insure to us these advantages! Our alliance with Russia is proclaimed by nature,—it is revealed by geography. *It is an alliance of war, to preserve two great races from danger*: it secures an equilibrium of peace, by placing two great weights on each side of the Continent, to keep down the centre, and by banishing England, as their satellite, to the sea and to Asia.\*

The deliberate proposal by M. de Lamartine of an object so violent and aggressive in itself, and attainable only through years of universal war, is a curious comment on ‘*La fraternité proclamée en principe, entre les peuples, pour abolir la guerre en abolissant les conquêtes.*’ But these are not barren speculations. From M. de Lamartine’s principles of conduct we turn to his acts.

The first is the celebrated manifesto of the 6th of March.

In that manifesto he declares that the French Republic considers the treaties of 1815 as no longer binding on her; though she admits as a matter of fact their territorial demarcations. And, further, ‘that when the hour for the reconstruction of any oppressed nationalities shall appear to France to have arrived, in the decrees of Providence, — the French Republic will think herself justified in arming for their protection.’

Among the attacks which have lately been made on that weak defence of civilisation, international law, this manifesto appears to us to be the boldest and the most mischievous. As Lamartine, while repudiating in the name of the French Republic the treaties which, as he himself admits, have for the last thirty-four years formed the base of the public law of Europe, does not state the cause through which they have ceased to be obligatory, we are left to conjecture it.

Is it that Russia, by incorporating the kingdom of Poland, and Austria, by seizing the republic of Cracow,—both of which acts were violations of the Congress of Vienna,—has released France from her obligations? It may be so. But how do those events affect the rights of England? The treaty of the 20th of Nov., 1815, between France and England, was an independent treaty; not referring to the Act of the Congress signed many months before—before the battle of Waterloo,—and to which France, then under the government of Napoleon, was not really a party. England, who took not merely a substantial but an active part in the

---

\* We copy the rather obscure conclusion:—‘*L’alliance Russe, c’est le cri de la nature. C’est la révélation des géographies. C’est l’alliance de guerre pour les éventualités de l’avenir de deux grandes races. C’est l’équilibre de paix par deux grands poids aux extrémités du Continent—contenant le milieu, et reléguant l’Angleterre, comme une puissance satellite sur l’océan et en Asie.*’ (Tome ii. p. 14.)

Act of the Congress, was as much injured by the violations of it as France. To hold then that these violations had the effect of depriving England of the benefit of the engagements made to her by France, would render nugatory all complicated arrangements; or all at least to which France may be a party! We cannot suppose that the Republic means to disclaim, in the mass, all the obligations of the Monarchy: Since this would be an extremity of bad faith, of which no one ought to be accused till he avows it.

The only remaining pretext that occurs to us is, that the treaties of 1815 were extorted from France by force. Of course they were extorted by force. Every disadvantageous peace is extorted by force. The treaty which recognised the independence of the United States was extorted from England by force. The treaty which gave Norway to Sweden was extorted from Denmark by force; that which gave Finland to Russia was extorted from Sweden by force; that which ended the late war between Austria and Piedmont was extorted from Piedmont by force. But are these treaties therefore void? or, what is the same thing, valid only until the beaten party is strong enough to repudiate them? If this be the law of nations, the practice of nations must revert to what it was 2000 years ago. If the beaten party is not to be bound by stipulations longer than he is too weak to reject them, the consequence will be that he must be rendered incapable of ever doing further injury. If he cannot purchase safety by engagements, he must be destroyed. All wars must become wars of extermination.

The offer of assistance to oppressed nationalities, when translated into intelligible language, is an offer of the armed interference of France to detach from their existing government any portions of a composite empire, distinguished by race or language from their fellow subjects, which *she* may think fit to consider oppressed, and called by Providence to separate independence. When we recollect that almost every kingdom of Europe is a union of distinct nations,—that neither the Swedish, the Danish, the Russian, the Prussian, the Austrian, the Turkish, the Neapolitan, the Sardinian, the Belgian, the Dutch, nor the British state is homogeneous, this is, in fact, a threat on the part of France to interfere by force in the domestic concerns of almost every government in Europe,—and to interfere for the express purpose of dismembering it. It is an open encouragement to the barbarous feeling which leads men to quarrel because they differ in language or in race,—which drives the Irish to clamour for repeal, the Holsteiners to demand separation, and the Croats to attack the Magyars; and has done more, within

the last year, to retard the civilisation of Europe than can be repaired during the remainder of the century. So little did Lamartine know what he was doing, that his comment on this manifesto is, that it created no source of war, but removed many; that it abolished ambition and conquest!

His second measure was to assemble an army on the frontier of Savoy, in order, as is not obscurely insinuated, to make the war between Piedmont and Austria a means of seizing on Savoy. "Whatever," he says, "were the results of that war, the French army was to pass the Alps, in order to act or negotiate in arms." This was Lamartine's policy. His successors abandoned it,—he does not judge their conduct—he only relates it.\*

A third measure was, in a time of profound peace, and with a national income inferior by about twelve millions sterling to the national expenditure, to endeavour to raise the army from 370,000 men to 580,000†; that is to say, to about one person in fifty-eight of the whole population, or to about one in fourteen of the able-bodied males. In the course of the year, he tells us that the number of 520,000 was actually reached; or about one in sixty-four of the whole population, and one in sixteen of the able-bodied males:—a military force which, in proportion to the population of the country, is about three times as large as that of England, and twice as large as that of Russia,—an army not exceeding, perhaps, the amount which a foreign policy of ambition and interference might require, but destined, if it be maintained, from its magnitude when compared to the resources of the country, to ruin its finances, and ultimately to destroy the little that it has retained of liberty.

In general a minister is held responsible for all the acts of the cabinet. He is so responsible, because he voluntarily joined them and voluntarily remains with them. It is assumed that he knew beforehand what would be the outline and general course of their policy; and if he finds that they propose any thing which he thinks seriously mischievous, he ought to resign. But we do not apply this rule to M. de Lamartine. He knew little—indeed it was impossible that he could know much—of his associates. We believe that he exercised little influence—much less than might be inferred from his own narrative—on their selection. He firmly believed that any change in the Provisional Government before the meeting of the Assembly would destroy it, and leave France in the midst of the tempest without a steersman. With this belief, he could neither resign himself, nor require, or indeed permit, the resignation of any of his associates,

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 278. ; see also p. 283.

† Vol. ii. p. 51.

— however numerous and deep-rooted might be their subjects of disagreement. This system must have been fatal to his influence. The lever with which the member of a cabinet acts on his colleagues, in ordinary circumstances, is the threat of resignation. He uses it against measures, and, as a last resource, he uses it against men. But Lamartine could do neither. However he might disapprove of those whom he generally indicates as ‘the minority in the government,’ (though it is clear that they often were the majority,) he could not quit them,—and he could not displace them. The evidence of several of his colleagues, taken by the commissioners of inquiry into the events of the 23rd of June and the 15th of May, contains some curious revelations. We will quote a few of them, beginning by that of one of the most eminent of the number—M. Arago.

‘I admit that there was a disagreement in the Government: it contained two opposing elements,—a republic of moderation, and one of violence. We (that is the moderate party) were attacked, sometimes by reasoning, sometimes by threats. It was not only in the streets, but at the council-table, that the red flag was proposed. I answered that I had rather be cut to pieces than adopt that symbol. As the discussion became violent, I said, “Call in your partisans: I will have the *rappel* beaten, and we will fight it out.” They were always ready to threaten us with the musket. “Well, be it so: the musket!” I used to answer.’\*

He is followed by Garnier Pagès:—

‘The Provisional Government contained several elements. There was the Socialist element, represented by Louis Blanc and Albert; there were the advanced republicans, represented by Ledru Rollin and Flocon. From the 24th of February to the 24th of June we were in a perpetual struggle. In order to hold together, without resignation or rupture, till the meeting of the Assembly, we were forced to submit to one continued system of compromise.’†

The next witness is M. Marrast:—

‘There were,’ he said, ‘three parties in the Provisional Government,—Socialism and Communism, represented by Louis Blanc and Albert; the Violent Republic represented by Ledru Rollin and Flocon; and the Moderate Republic, by Dupont de l’Eure, Arago, Lamartine, Garnier Pagès, Marie, and himself.

\* *Enquête*, tome i. p. 224—230. The original is, ‘Des coups de fusils, nous disait-on alors assez facilement: et bien-soit: des coups de fusils répondais-je.’

† *Ibid.* p. 284.

‘ There was a constant war between himself as mayor of Paris, and Ledru Rollin as Home Minister. Once Ledru Rollin resigned. Lamartine persuaded him to continue. On the question of delaying the election of the Assembly he was ‘inexcusably violent. “When one has 200,000 men at one’s “command,” he said, “one may venture any thing, and the “Assembly itself shall not stop me.”’\*’

We shall end these extracts by the evidence of two witnesses not actually members of the Government, but nearly connected with it. One is M. Carlier, directeur de la Police:—

‘ There were in fact four governments,—one that of Louis Blanc and Albert, who wished for Communism; another that of Ledru Rollin, who desired the Red Republic and Terror; the third that of M. de Lamartine, who wished to conciliate everybody, and thought that he could do so by his eloquence; and the fourth that of Arago, Marie, Garnier Pagès, and Marrast, who represented the moderate party. The evil influences worked separately and silently, on ordinary occasions; but whenever there was an insurrection they united.’

The other is M. Goudchaux, for a short time their Minister of Finance:—

‘ The disagreement in the Provisional Government was constant. Lamartine gave up his opinions one by one. He let himself be overpowered and carried away. He wished to stand always as a sort of umpire; and thought that with his eloquence he could manage everybody. Ardour with him was capacity. He hoped to use the violent, and to control them.’†

To add to the difficulties of the moderate party, two of the most important of the subordinate ministries, the Postes and the Police, were occupied by E. Arago and Caussidière,—men appointed, as we have seen, in the bureau of the ‘Réforme’ newspaper—and claiming, therefore, an independent title and a sort of independent authority, and throwing their influence on the side of the violent party.

The great *practical* questions that first divided the Government were, the period at which they were to be superseded by the meeting of the National Assembly, and the degree in which they ought to endeavour to give a decided character to that Assembly. Lamartine was wisely and sincerely anxious to retire as soon as possible from his slippery post; and desired that the Assembly, which was to provide for the immediate, and for the future, government of France, should fairly represent

\* *Enquête*, p. 246, 247.

† *Ibid.* p. 289—310.

the opinions and wishes of the French people. But the Violent party, both in the Government and in the streets, were anxious to prolong the existing state of things; under which Paris dictated to France, and they dictated to Paris. And they were still more anxious that, when at last the Assembly must meet, it should be found to contain a majority which would give effect to *their* theories, and maintain *them* in power.

The first open conflict between the two parties seems to have taken place with respect to the latter question. In the beginning of March, Ledru Rollin, as Minister of the Interior, issued circulars to the Commissioners, who had been sent, as a kind of proconsuls, into the provinces. In the first of them, that of the 8th of March, 'Take as your rule,' he said, 'that political functions, whatever be their rank, must be entrusted only to tried republicans. Those who have obeyed the contemptible power which the popular breath has just blown away, cannot serve the people. Place everywhere men whose hearts and courage are *with us*,—men who will give us an Assembly capable of understanding and carrying out the will of the people;—in a word, men *de la veille, et pas du lendemain*.'\*

By the second, dated the 12th of March, he informed them that their powers, like those of the government which they represented, were absolute. 'The victory of the people,' he said, 'has thrown on you the duty of completing its work; and for that purpose it invests you with its sovereignty: *you are responsible only to your own consciences*. Whatever the public safety requires, you must do. *Your great business is with the elections*. Be on your guard against those who, having served a king, now profess to serve a people. The Assembly must be animated with the spirit of the revolution. Those who ask a seat in it must be pure from the traditions of the past. Let the word everywhere be, new men! and, if possible, from the mass of the people. No compromises,—no compliances. Let the day of the election be the triumph of the revolution.'†

'These circulars,' says Lamartine, 'rang like a tocsin through the country. They suddenly roused it from its dreams of concord and peace. Men shuddered at the words "Your powers are boundless"—which brought again to mind the Commissioners of the old Convention. The attempt to confine political power to the republicans *de la veille*, was an attempt to disfranchise nearly the whole nation; for if the number of those whose reason preferred a republic was immense, that of those who would have taken steps to obtain one was very small.‡ Lamartine

\* Actes du Gouvernement Provisoire, 2de partie, p. 91.

† Ibid. 2de partie, p. 125.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 184. We are not sure that we have discovered the

felt that if these circulars were not disavowed, the republic would become the tyranny of a minority, to be upheld by terror within and by war without, by disturbance, by exactions, by dismissals,—in short, by revolutionary violence in all its forms. He, and the majority of his colleagues, were resolved to suffer a thousand deaths rather than bear, before God, before history, and before their own consciences, the responsibility of so execrable a government.\*

He summoned, therefore, a meeting of the whole Government for the 16th of March. The debate was violent; and lasted for several hours. It ended in the adoption and publication of a proclamation drawn up by Lamartine, and intended to be a disavowal of the circulars of Ledru Rollin. But we must confess that it appears to us a very faint disavowal. The strongest passages are those which urge the people to respect in others the freedom of suffrage which they demand for themselves,—not to scrutinise the names which those whom they may think their enemies write on their cards, but *to trust* that they are those of true republicans. ‘Trust,’ it says, ‘the good sense of the people,—give it liberty, and it will give you back the republic.’†

The next day, however, the celebrated 17th of March, the minority took a signal revenge. The Socialist and Red party as usual combined. Under the direction of Caussidière, Louis Blanc, Blanqui, Barbès, Sobrier, and the other veterans of insurrection and conspiracy, a demonstration—to use the revolutionary name—was prepared, which was to carry to the Government the will of the people.

‘At noon on the 17th,’ says M. de Lamartine, ‘the members of the Government were assembled at the Hôtel de Ville. From time to time they went out on the balcony to watch for the column. At length it showed itself over the approaches of the bridge. At its head were about 600 men, the leaders of the clubs, in ranks of about forty abreast. Before each club was its flag, borne by two or three men, and a woman wearing the hideous bonnet rouge. Immediately behind marched a broad compact column of workmen, of all professions, decently dressed, grave, modest, inoffensive, abstaining from every alarming gesture or word, and appearing to think that they were performing an act of calm and holy patriotism. The first ranks of this column filled the Place de l’Hôtel de Ville, and its centre and rear

---

sense of the last of these sentences. The original is this:—‘Car si le nombre des républicains de raison était immense, le nombre des républicains de faction était bien petit.’

\* Vol. ii. p. 185.

† Actes du Gouvernement Provisoire, partie 1er, p. 148.

extended back to the extremity of the Champs Elysées. Its number was estimated at from 100,000 to 140,000 men.\*

About 100 of the leaders were admitted, and received by the Provisional Government in the great hall of the Hôtel de Ville, the most historical room now remaining in Paris; — the hall in which sat the formidable Commune de Paris; from whose window Hanriot was thrown; on whose floor Robespierre lay mortally wounded on the morning of the 10th Thermidor.

Blanqui, speaking in the name of the people, in decent but imperious terms, required the postponement for ten days of the election of the officers of the National Guard; the postponement for an indefinite time of the meeting of the National Assembly, then fixed for the 20th of April; and the perpetual exclusion from Paris of the regular army.

He was answered by Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollin, — whose expressions of indignation must have been amusing to those who were in the secret, — by Crémieux, by Marie, and by Dupont de l'Eure. 'The answers,' says Lamartine, 'were not very clear. It was admitted that we agreed with them in some points, that we differed in others, and we promised to deliberate on all.' He has given us his own speech. It contains a promise to consider the question as to the National Guard; and denies any intention to bring back the troops to Paris. 'We never have thought,' he said, 'of doing so; we do not think of doing so; we never shall think of doing so. This is the truth. Tell it to the people. The Republic wants at home no defenders but the people in arms.' As to the postponement of the meeting of the Assembly, he refused to make any engagement inconsistent with the rights of the whole country; but promised, as his colleagues had done, to make it the subject of serious deliberation. The fate of the Government now depended on the will of the instigators of the movement — Blanqui, Barbès, Sobrier, Raspail, and Cabet. Cabet took the lead, and advised his followers to grant the proposed terms of capitulation. The other leaders acquiesced; the delegates retired, and Louis Blanc harangued the people from the balcony, and thanked them in the name of the Provisional Government for the irresistible force which they had placed at its disposal.

'The majority of the Government,' says Lamartine, 'affected to be pleased and grateful! But their hearts were torn by the audacity and success of the conspirators. They now began to distrust a force, over which there was no control. Lamartine himself understood what had passed. He saw that the moderate majority had received a signal



defeat; and that those who called themselves their supporters were in fact their tyrants.\*

But the measure of his humiliation was not yet full. The next day he had to sign a proclamation in which the Provisional Government solemnly thanked the people of Paris for 'la manifestation si imposante dont vous avez donné hier le magnifique spectacle.' 'The Provisional Government,' it added, 'has seen its power confirmed by 200,000 citizens, marching with the calmness of power. People of Paris, you have been as great in this manifestation as you were courageous behind your barricades. Again the Government thanks you. The elections of the National Guard are postponed to the 5th of April.'† The best comment on these transactions is that of a very intelligent bystander,—M. Emile Thomas, the director of the ateliers nationaux, whose intimate connexion both with the Provisional Government and with the working classes of Paris, gave him better opportunities of ascertaining the progress of events than were enjoyed by perhaps any other individual.

'The effect,' he says, 'of the manifestation of the 17th of March was terrible. It struck with consternation the moderate portion of the Government; it gave triumphant influence to Ledru Rollin and his friends; and it showed to the work-people the extent of their power. It may be well to state what was the previous state of the Government. Before the 17th of March it stood thus: on one side, De Lamartine, Marrast, Garnier Pagès, Arago, and Marie; on the other, Ledru Rollin, Flocon, Crémieux, Louis Blanc, and Albert. I omit the venerable Dupont de l'Eure, whose age, and still more whose character, kept him aloof from these struggles of ambition. After the 17th of March the moderate party was reduced to Marrast, Arago, and Marie. Garnier Pagès was undecided; De Lamartine, terrified by the nature and by the strength of the popular current, hesitated before the alternative of civil war. He was neutral for a time; but it was to unite himself afterwards with the man who seemed to have the popular sympathy on his side. Crémieux, Louis Blanc, and Albert, connected themselves more strictly with Flocon and with Ledru Rollin, who afterwards alone gave to the Provisional Government its impulse; modified only by the wild preaching of Louis Blanc, which a month after threw him out of the sphere of his colleagues, into that of Raspail, Barbès, and Blanqui.'‡

---

\* Vol. ii. pp. 225—227.

† Actes du Gouvernement Provisoire, 1er partie, p. 152.

‡ Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux, par Emile Thomas, p. 98.

Lamartine's own narrative, on the whole, confirms Emile Thomas. Between the 17th of March, he says, and the meeting of the Assembly, lay an abyss of anarchy. The wisest of his friends denied that it could be crossed.

'Never,' they said, 'will the Ultra-Republican party, already entrenched within the Government, commanding 200,000 men in Paris, with its commissioners and clubs in the departments, and the artisans everywhere; masters of the police, of the Luxembourg, of the streets, of the National Guard from the suburbs, and of the *ateliers nationaux*, never will this party allow the election of an Assembly to tear it from power. Lamartine knew well all these sources of danger—but the lot was cast—His death, if he was to die in the attempt, would be avenged! And so he proceeded, resolved to work his way by concession or by force, (*decidé à transiger ou à combattre*) to his two great objects, the preservation of peace abroad, and the meeting of the Assembly.\*

The means which he adopted were, as he tells us, two: first, taking measures for putting, as soon as possible, Paris, or at least the Government, under the protection of a regular army; and second, seeking to acquire an influence over the subordinate conspirators. For the first purpose, he entered into correspondence with Négrier, the commander of the army of the North, and ascertained that he could rely on his assistance, if an insurrection should drive the Provisional Government out of Paris; he also persuaded General Cavaignac to accept the war office; and he urged the clothing and training of the *garde mobile*, which, though only three weeks had passed since the date of the decree which created it, already amounted to several thousands. His endeavours to bring over, or at least to mollify, the inferior members of the ultra-republican party, appeared to him to succeed with the leaders of the principal clubs—with Cabet, with Barbès, with Raspail, and with Sobrier. If he could not persuade them all to abandon their schemes, he obtained at least an adjournment. He has given us an interesting account of his interview with one of the fiercest of the conspirators—Blanqui. It ended in Blanqui's pouring out to Lamartine his whole soul. He told him the history of his life; which had been passed in plotting against every government under which he had lived,—he described his passion for a woman, who had shared his sufferings until they killed her,—his solitary meditations,—his religious aspirations,—his dislike of bloodshed,—and at last his irresistible craving for conspiracy—a taste which long indulgence had made a second nature. Lamartine now thought that he perceived in him the tact

and sagacity of a negotiator, and asked him if he would exchange his life of treason for one of diplomacy. Blanqui, he says, seemed inclined to accept the offer. If it had been carried into effect, it would have been an amusing incident in the revolutionary phantasmagoria. He did not confine his seductions to the leaders of the clubs. The popular demagogues of the turbulent districts—St. Marceau, St. Antoine, and the Bastille—passed whole nights in the gilded saloons of the Hôtel des Affaires Etrangères, discussing with him unreservedly the domestic and foreign policy of the Government, and the economical and social questions which are still perplexing the half-educated population of the great towns of France. Sometimes he convinced them that their opinions were absurd and their plans mischievous; but, at the worst, he thus learned what those opinions and plans were,—and he believes that this knowledge enabled him to save Paris and the Assembly.

In the meantime, the factions in the Government became more and more hostile. Their meetings, says Lamartine, were few, short, and full of suspicion and irritation. One party was suspected of aiming at counter-revolution and restoration; the other of striving to keep by force the power which accident had thrown into their hands. On the 26th of March, Ledru Rollin, on the pretext that the National Guards had not yet received their arms and uniforms, forced an adjournment of the election of the Assembly from the 9th to the 27th of April. This produced a truce, but a short one.

‘The two camps,’ says M. de Lamartine, ‘which were now established in the Government, were the centres of opposite tendencies and systems. The partisans of each, violent and suspicious, were grouped round their chiefs, irritated their mutual dislike, resentment, and mistrust, and at last led them to plot against one another,—to lend their names and their cause to factions, and to urge those factions to extremities. The place of meeting was frequently changed. Precautions were taken against an assault. Two or three hundred men were often brought together secretly and posted in the neighbourhood of the Ministère des Finances, (in the Rue de Rivoli,) or of the Luxembourg, to prevent a surprise. Each party kept watch on the other.’\*

By the end of the second week of April, the National Guard had elected its officers and received its arms, but was not fully equipped. It had not yet been called out, and no one could foresee what would be its opinions: there seems, however, to have been a suspicion that it would side in general with the moderate party; for we are told that the violent party wished

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 303.

the decisive struggle to take place before it could be called out. The dissensions in the Government became fiercer. Ledru Rollin seldom appeared at their councils. Louis Blanc and Albert, masters of the army of thirty or forty thousand workmen, whose delegates met at the Luxembourg, reported to the Government, without justifying them, the demands and threats of their followers. On the 14th of April, at a council which lasted long into the night, they confessed in a tone partly of grief and partly of complaint, that a manifestation, resembling that of the 17th of March, was likely to take place,—to obtain a further postponement of the elections, and redress of other grievances of the people. They promised, however, to endeavour to prevent it. The next day, the 15th, they lamented that their endeavours had been unsuccessful; but assured their colleagues that they had obtained a promise from the agitators that the character of the manifestation should be free from violence. Lamartine answered, in a tone of despair, that the violence consisted in the number: that a visit from 150,000 remonstrants, however calm their demeanour, was enough to overthrow a defenceless government.

At night, Lamartine, before he went to bed, burnt most of his papers. He was roused in his first sleep by some of his friends from the clubs, who brought him news that the conspirators had resolved the next day to collect 100,000 men on the Champ de Mars at noon; to march along the quays to the Hôtel de Ville, and there to expel the Provisional Government, and to substitute a Committee of Public Safety—consisting of Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc, Albert, Arago (whose opinions they misunderstood), and some of the most violent of the subordinate agitators. According to the evidence of M. Marrast, of which we have already cited a part, the Committee of Public Safety, as finally settled at Sobrier's after having been discussed at Ledru Rollin's, was to consist of Ledru Rollin, Flocon, and Albert, with the addition of Raspail, Blanqui, Kerausie, and Cabot. Ledru Rollin, however, refused to be associated with Blanqui—and Blanqui with Ledru Rollin\*; and this probably prevented the success of the conspiracy. Blanqui appears to have announced what was going on to Lamartine on the night of the 15th. The next morning, at about eleven, while Lamartine, still at his own house, was listening to reports of the gradual increase of the meeting in the Champ de Mars, Ledru Rollin was announced. He came—as his rival, Blanqui, had done a few hours before—to reveal the plans of

---

\* Enquête, tome i. p. 322.

the conspirators, which he professed to have learned only during the night. He was full, of course, of indignation, and of resolution to prefer death to treason! In a few hours, he said, we shall be attacked by more than 100,000 men. What is to be done?

'Of course,' said Lamartine, 'to beat the *rappel*, and call out the National Guard. You are Minister of the Interior,—it is your business. I will go to the Hôtel de Ville and shut myself up there with such battalions of the Garde Mobile as I can find. If the National Guard comes to my assistance, the insurrection will be destroyed between two fires. If it do not answer to the *rappel*, I shall die at my post.'\*

They separated, apparently agreed on this course of action. Lamartine got together four companies of the Garde Mobile, and placed himself in the Hôtel de Ville. He found there Marrast, Mayor of Paris, and General Changarnier. Lamartine gave to the latter the command of his little garrison. It did not exceed four hundred men. In three hours he thought that the National Guard might be expected. Changarnier answered for a resistance of seven hours. The column of attack was by this time in motion. The scouts reported that its head had already reached the Quai de Chaillot, not three miles from the Hôtel de Ville, and the *rappel* was not to be heard. Ledru Rollin had forgotten his promise! There is some doubt as to the person to whom the actual calling out of the National Guard is due. Lamartine says that it was done by himself, Marrast, and Changarnier.

The following is Changarnier's own story: 'On the morning of the 16th I was an ambassador. At a quarter after twelve I went to M. de Lamartine to take his final instructions, and to request that I might be sent off to Berlin immediately. I found there a secretary, and asked some questions about Holstein. "Don't talk of Holstein," he said; "at this instant "M. de Lamartine may be killed." Madame de Lamartine entreated me to go to the Hôtel de Ville. I found there Marrast. Lamartine soon arrived. He seemed disturbed; talked of the divisions of the Government, and complained of Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollin, whom he believed to be engaged in the insurrection. As he took no steps, I acted of my own accord. General Courtais had summoned only a piquet from each legion. I thought that the *rappel général* ought to be beaten. Marrast wrote the order, at my dictation; and this was the summons which called out the National Guards.'†

\* Vol. ii. p. 347.

† Enquête, vol. i. p. 260.

The tenants of the Hôtel de Ville looked anxiously up the river to see whether the attack or the relief would arrive first. At the northern end of the Pont Royal a column of insurgents, about thirty thousand strong, headed by some of the fiercest Clubbists and Socialists, encountered a body of National Guards marching along the Quay of the Louvre. The National Guards let it pass, closed up behind it, and marched after it along the quay. The red flags of the first ranks of the insurgents had just shown themselves on the Place de Grève, when a forest of bayonets shone on the other side of the river. It consisted of thirty or forty thousand National Guards from the left bank of the Seine. They rushed at once into the Place de Grève; interposed themselves between the insurgents and the Hôtel de Ville, and forced them to disperse under the pressure of two armed bodies of superior numbers. The day ended as usual — with harangues by Lamartine on the steps, in the courts, and from the windows.

This 16th of April is one of the most important days which has occurred during the present revolution. It was the first check received by the democratic party. The success of the Government seems, however, to have depended on the accidental presence of General Changarnier at the Hôtel de Ville. For it is clear that Lamartine was afraid to incur the responsibility of calling out the National Guards. Though warned for some days of what was coming, he did not think of this, the only effectual defence, till late in the morning of the 16th, when the enemy was already in force in the Champ de Mars. He left it too, to be done by Ledru Rollin, without seeing that he did it; and though he knew that Ledru Rollin was engaged in the conspiracy. And when, as might be expected, it was left undone, Changarnier describes him as helpless. He tells us that on the 15th he and his colleagues 'left to God and to the people the fate of the next day.\*' He thinks this, however, the finest day of his political life.† Five days after, on the 21st, the regular army was brought back to Paris.

On the 27th the election of the Assembly took place. On the 4th of May it met. Lamartine was now the most popular man in France. The extent to which he had promoted the revolution was not generally known; and his conduct in the Chamber of Deputies was forgotten, in the gratitude inspired by his resistance to the Ultra-Republican faction. The New Assembly was, as he tells us, 'non républicain, ou peu républicain.‡

\* Vol. ii. p. 340.

† Vol. ii. p. 332.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 406.

The great majority were country people, little acquainted with public business, or with Paris; oppressed by the new responsibility of having in their hands the destiny of a great nation, and terrified by the dangers, physical as well as moral, of their strangely acquired position. They had been warned by the Provisional Government, that the people of Paris, if dissatisfied with their votes, would exercise against them the sacred right of insurrection. They knew that at the elections of the officers of the National Guard, and even of the Garde Mobile, the question 'How will you act if the Assembly does not sympathise with the people?' had been frequently asked,—and that the popular answer had been, 'March against it.'

Their first reception, by their new subjects could not have been encouraging. They were made to walk on foot, through ranks of men under arms, from the Place Vendôme to the Palais Bourbon; and when they arrived there, instead of enjoying, in pursuance of the engagement of the Provisional Government, absolute freedom in the choice of a constitution, they had to cry *Vive la République*, according to the best computation, seventeen times in one day. They were required, in the name of the heroic people of Paris, to interrupt their debates, present themselves before the mob under their portico, and shout for the republic! It has been said that they were shown in their vaults an armoury, containing 900 muskets, and informed that it might be necessary to use them in self-defence. Lamartine and Ledru Rollin were at that time supposed to represent the opposite extremes of moderation and of violence, of peace and of war, of order and of anarchy. The great majority, accordingly, were ready to throw themselves at the feet of Lamartine, and implore his advice, his assistance, and his protection; and—in order to enable him to afford them—to appoint him by acclamation the temporary President of the Republic.

'All the Assembly, all Paris, all France, indeed all Europe,' he says, 'had their eyes fixed on him—eager to applaud him if he accepted the dictatorship, to revile him if he refused it. He could not conceal from himself that his popularity had become an absolute passion,—that the ten different elections which made him a sort of member for France, the seven or eight millions of votes which were offered to him if the voice of the people should become necessary, and the support of six or seven hundred of the nine hundred representatives, pointed him out as the man predestined to exercise undivided power. He felt that he had the necessary strength; and he believed that he had the necessary prudence. The glory of having not only called forth the Assembly, but established it,—of becoming the first lawful authority of his country, after being her first revolutionary ruler,—

of being the founder and protector of her infant freedom, offered to him a brilliant and permanent place in the records of distant ages.\*

Two motives, however, overbalanced this strong temptation. In the first place, he now believed, as we have already stated, that neither France nor the Assembly was at heart republican; and that the jealousy which his elevation,—supposing him able to maintain it,—would excite, would break into factions the republican party, and open a breach for the return of monarchy.

In the second place, he did not believe that he could maintain himself in the Assembly, if he admitted among his ministers the Ultra-Republican party—or in Paris, if he excluded them!

'The Assembly,' he said to his friends, 'will name me president, on a tacit understanding that I exclude from office the republicans. If I admit them, I declare war against the Assembly, by imposing on it ministers whom it distrusts and fears. If I exclude them, all my rivals in the Provisional Government, and many of my friends,—all the Republicans, whether Socialist, Terrorist, or Moderate, all the three or four hundred representatives who owe their seats to their democratic opinions, will combine against me. These men (the violent republicans) dispose of 120,000 men in the *Ateliers Nationaux*, an army now obedient, but which their voice can call into insurrection; they dispose also of the delegates of the different trades who meet at the Luxembourg, and of the 50,000 workpeople who are their fanatical followers; they dispose of the *prolétaires*† of the National Guard, at least 60,000 bayonets; they are masters of the clubs, which they can rouse into insurrection in a single night; they have at their command the police, and the *Montagnards*, the *Lyonnais*, the *Gardes Républicains*, the *Gardiens de Paris*, the *Guides*, in short, all the armed revolutionary bands which are under its influence. The day after I shall construct my exclusive ministry, the Assembly will be attacked, will be conquered, and either degraded into a tool of the conquerors, or stain with its blood the halls in which I have seated it.†

A third course, however, was proposed to him. To retire from official life, and let France endeavour to do without him.

'This course,' answered Lamartine, 'would be the most agreeable, and for me, personally, the wisest: but if I retire from the Assembly, it will instantly get rid of all my colleagues. It will place power in hands suspected by the republicans. That party will be irritated,—Paris will rise at its call: there will be the same calamities, though my name may not then be mixed with them. I shall save, perhaps

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 203.

† This word has no English equivalent, nor is its French signification fixed. Sometimes it is used by Lamartine as signifying persons without political power: sometimes, as in this case, without property.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 406—410.



raise, myself—by ruining the Assembly, the Republic, and the country. I will do the contrary, — ruin myself to save the Assembly.\*

On these grounds Lamartine impliedly refused the Presidency of the Republic, by supporting the motion of Dornés, that the Assembly should vest the executive power in a body of five Commissioners; and he deprecated the exclusion of the ultrarepublicans from that commission. 'The members of the Provisional Government,' he said, 'notwithstanding differences which were rather presumed than real, had separated the day before, full of mutual esteem, mutual gratitude, and mutual confidence.' The Assembly, after two days' debate, accepted, according to Lamartine from weariness, — according to our suspicion from fear, — what he calls 'this unsatisfactory but necessary measure.' It revenged itself, however, for his adherence to the anarchists, by placing him fourth on the list, — above Ledru Rollin, but below Arago, Garnier Pagès, and Marie. The Commissioners selected their ministers, says Lamartine, in the same spirit of compromise. Among them were Crémieux, Flocon, and Trelat, and what was still more significant, Caussidière. So that the police, which in Paris is almost the government, remained in the hands of one who was known to have been for three months a traitor and conspirator. Lamartine, with benevolent simplicity, seems to have really believed in his reformation.

Subsequent events have shown that in thus yielding to his fears Lamartine committed a grievous error. The very next week the Assembly was attacked and overpowered; and not six weeks later it had to sustain a long and doubtful battle. Such is usually the case when men act under fear: they encourage the enemy whom they try to conciliate.

Of course when we attribute fear to Lamartine, it is not personal fear. Perhaps there does not exist a man more ready to expose his life, or more calm while he is exposing it: nor is he deficient at times in moral courage. To take part in the Provisional Government was an act of courage amounting to rashness. But Nature, intending him to delight the world, and not suspecting that he would try to rule it, has given to him an imagination, out of all proportion to his judgment. The images which it forms are of gigantic dimensions. It inflated Ledru Rollin into a Danton, and the Club des Clubs into a new Club des Jacobins. In the sleepless nights during which, as he tells us, he meditated on the acceptance or refusal of undivided power, he conjured up spectres of danger, as unsubstantial as they were imposing.

He estimated, for instance, the ultra-republican force in Paris at 120,000 men from the *Ateliers Nationaux*, 50,000 from the Luxembourg, 60,000 from the National Guards, — making together 230,000; besides the miscellaneous forces of the clubs, the Montagnards, and the other revolutionary bands, which really did amount to about 20,000 more. This gives a revolutionary army of 250,000 men, — enough certainly to make the stoutest heart quake. But we do not believe that, after subtracting the army and the *Garde Mobile*, there are much more than 300,000 men capable of bearing arms in Paris; and no one can believe that five sixths of them would have actually risen against the Government. We do not believe that the number which has been brought to fight in any insurrection has ever amounted to 40,000. If Lamartine, on the 9th of May, had frankly united himself to the majority of the Assembly, supported as it was by all the regular troops, and by the vast majority of the National Guards, the riot of the 15th of May might have been a little more serious, and the insurrection of the 23rd of June a little less so; we have little doubt, however, that the ultimate result in both cases would have been what it was.

On comparing the passages which we have quoted from this work and from the '*Conseiller du Peuple*,' it will be seen that Lamartine makes apparently inconsistent statements of the grounds on which he retained office after the 4th of May. Here he says that he remained in the Government in order to prevent a battle — foreseeing that if he left it, the Chamber and the Republicans would quarrel. In the '*Conseiller du Peuple*' he says that he took office because he foresaw a battle, and thought it his duty to protect the Assembly with his breast and his popularity. Probably he thought it his duty to remain in either alternative. To prevent the battle, if it could be prevented; to join in it, if it could not.\*

---

\* A further extract from the letter which we have already quoted furnishes a cotemporary account of Lamartine's feelings:—

'The first time,' says our correspondent, 'that I spoke to Lamartine after the 24th of February, was on the 4th of May. We had then rather a warm discussion: I maintained that we ought to seize the opportunity to make use of the feeling exhibited by the nation, and to employ our parliamentary majority in energetic measures, for the re-establishment of order. "That must bring with it," said Lamartine, "a frightful battle." "A battle," I replied, "is inevitable, do what we will; and if it comes immediately, we shall gain it." "I had rather," he answered, "try to avoid one, and I think that I shall succeed." He was mistaken in thinking that the battle could be avoided; but when I saw the terrible days of June,

We shall imitate Lamartine in passing rapidly over the rest of his political life. The confidence which he had inspired at the meeting of the Assembly, already much diminished by his alliance with Ledru Rollin, was further shaken, by the 15th of May, and utterly destroyed by the 23d of June. By that time, indeed, the people of France had become tired of a collective executive: And they restored the monarchical element—first in General Cavaignac, and afterwards, more effectually, in Louis Napoleon.

On the whole, we do not believe that the '*Histoire de la Révolution de 1848*' will raise M. de Lamartine's reputation. It shows his conduct to have been weaker, and his principles of action to be more absurd, than we had thought possible. But this circumstance adds to its interest, by adding to its credibility. Neither the actions nor the motives which he avows are such as a man would ascribe to himself falsely. And we must add, that when we have had an opportunity of testing the truth of his narrative, by comparing it with that of other witnesses, we have generally found it correct. We have seen, for instance, an account drawn up by Marshal Bugeaud, in his own handwriting, of the events of the 24th of February, so far as he took part in them. The story, as told by Lamartine, agrees with this paper in its minutest details; and probably was taken from the Marshal's own lips.

As a literary work it has striking merits, and glaring defects. The narrative is clear and interesting, and is interspersed with scenes full of picturesque details: often, however, so minute and so highly coloured, that the reader is inclined to suspect that they are the result rather of fancy than of recollection. Many of them look like pieces of a poem inserted by mistake in a history. Such, for instance, is his picture of his own fortunes before the barricades on the 22d of June:—'*Trois fois il s'élança de son cheval pour aller au pied de la barricade, trois fois les gardes de l'assemblée l'entourèrent de leurs bras, et le retinrent par la violence.*'\*

---

'I excused his shrinking from it. He had been nearer to the revolutionary army than I had been; and if he exaggerated its terrors, perhaps I undervalued them. Now I am inclined to think that the interval between the meeting of the Assembly, and the great civil war, was more profitable to us than to the enemy. Every one saw that the questions at issue could be decided only by force. Each party employed these five weeks in preparation; and I think that we employed them best. I am not sure that those who conquered in June might not have been beaten in May.'

\* Vol. ii. p. 184.

Τρις μὲν ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος βῆ τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο,  
 . . . . τρις δ' αὐτὸν ἀπεστυφέλιξεν Ἀπόλλων.

Such too is his description of his ride that evening among the insurgents, and of the flowers which they strewed in his path, and showered over his horse. A more graceful exit from a scene of rebellion and bloodshed can scarcely be imagined. But he lets himself out, we fear, from the civil war, as the Sibyl let out Æneas from the Shades — by the Ivory Gate.

'Quâ falsa ad cœlum mittunt insomnia manes.'

The style is vivid and forcible ; but, as the reader must have perceived in our extracts, often vague and forced, and deformed by broken metaphors and by almost ludicrous exaggerations. Exaggeration, indeed, is the prevailing fault both of his thoughts and of the language in which he clothes them. All those with whom he comes in contact are angels or demons. They are either endowed with perfect beauty, eloquence, and virtue, or are deformed by 'le vertige du désordre, la volupté du chaos, la 'soif du sang.' Under his pencil a riot becomes an insurrection, a street row a battle. A great source of the defects of the book probably is, that it was composed far too rapidly. M. de Lamartine has lately been writing at the rate of more than half a dozen octavos per year. It is impossible that works so hastily put together can do justice to their author. A man with powers like his ought to write for posterity.

---

*No. CLXXXIV. will be published in April.*



THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1850.

NO. CLXXXIV.

- ART. I. — 1. *Astronomical Observations made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, in the Year 1847.* Under the Direction of GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, Esq., M. A., Astronomer Royal.
2. *Magnetical and Meteorological Observations made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, in the Year 1847.* Under the Direction of GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, Esq., M. A., Astronomer Royal.
3. *Reduction of Observations of the Planets made at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, from 1750 to 1830.* Computed by Order of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, under the Superintendence of GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, Esq., M. A.; Astronomer Royal. 4to. 1845.
4. *Reduction of Observations of the Moon, from 1750 to 1830.* By G. B. AIRY, Esq. 2 vols. 4to. 1848.
5. *Description de l'Observatoire Central de Poulkova.* Par F. G. W. STRUVE. St. Petersburg, 1845. Fol.
6. *A Cycle of Celestial Objects observed, reduced, and discussed.* By Captain WM. HENRY SMYTH, R. N., &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 1844.
7. *Six Lectures on Astronomy, delivered at Meetings of the Friends of the Ipswich Museum.* By GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, Esq., M. A., Astronomer Royal. 8vo. 1849.

NO one has ever sailed down or up the Thames, and surveyed the stately domes and colonnades of Greenwich Hospital, without admiring the background which the wooded heights of

Greenwich Park give to the landscape, and the contrasting architecture of the brick towers and minarets of the Royal Observatory, placed on a commanding height in the prolongation of the middle area of the Hospital, and thus terminating the vista. But few of these voyagers, we suspect, take time to consider that the British Navy owes an important part of its efficiency not less to the Observatory than to the Hospital,—that Humanity is interested in the former as well as in the latter,—that the sovereign who foresaw the ultimate consequence to certain and safe Navigation of a good system of Astronomical observations, was in this instance as wise and patriotic as he who provided a magnificent asylum for the helpless old age of those who had already often owed the preservation of life to the patient vigils of the astronomer.

The fortunes of Greenwich Park have been as varied as those of most places the property of the crown in the vicinity of a capital. The manor of East Greenwich\* was an unenclosed waste until the reign of Henry VI., when a charter conveying 200 acres of it was given to Humphry, Duke of Gloster, the king's uncle, and to Eleanor, his wife.

This curious charter (of which a copy is now before us) is dated 26th March, 1437.† Perhaps the foundations of Duke Humphry's tower still exist; at all events, it is certain that the Observatory is built on the same site, being a position of no inconsiderable strength. It is a kind of peninsula jutting out towards the Thames from the general level of Blackheath and the southern district of the Park, with which it is connected by a tolerably narrow isthmus, whilst the ground slopes rapidly in every other direction from the little table-land occupied by the Observatory. The natural strength of the situation has evidently been increased by lofty retaining walls on the north, south, and west sides — sustaining both the building and a part of the

\* Deptford was *West* Greenwich.

† Rot. Patent, 15 Hen. 6., M. 7. As a specimen of the quaint latinity, we quote the following permission: — ‘*Muris petra et calce includere et firmare, et muros illos kernellare<sup>1</sup>, batellare, et turrellare, ac quandam Turrim infra Parcum prædictum similiter petra et calce de novo<sup>2</sup> construere, edificare, et tam turrim illam sic de novo constructam et edificatam quam dictum manerium sive mansionem ut præmittitur inclusum, firmatum, kernellatum, imbattelatum, et turrellatum, tenere possint sibi et hæredibus suis prædictis in perpetuum,*’ &c. Copied from the original in the Tower.

<sup>1</sup> *Kernellare*, from *créneaux* (Fr.), to make battlements for defence.

<sup>2</sup> Hence it appears that there had been some still older structure.

pleasure ground.\* This gives to the place an air of great seclusion and privacy, as well as apparent strength, not less suitable to its present than to its original destination—freedom from interruption and indiscreet curiosity being an inestimable advantage in an institution dedicated to such purposes in the midst of one of the most public resorts in the neighbourhood of the metropolis. Mr. Francis Baily states†, on the authority of some MS. notes in a copy of Maskelyne's 'Observations,' that the tower was 'repaired or rebuilt by Henry VIII. in 1528; that it was sometimes the habitation of the younger branches of the royal family, sometimes the residence of a favourite mistress, sometimes a prison, and sometimes a place of defence. Mary, fifth daughter of Edward IV., (betrothed to the King of Denmark) died at the Tower in Greenwich Park in 1482. Henry VIII. visited "a fayre lady whom he loved" here. In Queen Elizabeth's time it was called *Mirefleur*. In 1642, being then called Greenwich Castle, it was thought of so much consequence as a place of strength, that immediate steps were ordered to be taken for securing it. After the Restoration, Charles II., in 1675, pulled down the old tower, and founded on its site the present Royal Observatory.' It should be noticed, that there was a distinct royal residence on the same manor, between Duke Humphry's Tower and the river, called *The Pleasance*, which was frequented by Queen Elizabeth and other sovereigns.

Astronomy is a subject so palpable in its results, and conversant with facts so astounding yet so plain, that there is scarcely any age or period of the world in which most men have not, at some time or other of their lives, been drawn to it with a strong feeling of interest and awe. Perhaps some readers may be able to sympathise with our juvenile recollections of a time when the towers and walls of Greenwich Observatory seemed to us to enclose a profound yet tempting mystery, which we hardly dared hope ever to explore; or when we traversed the weary diameter of Paris to gaze on the Observatory built by Cassini, and directed by Arago, or trod with respect the very stones of the *Rue du Bac*, at that time inhabited by Laplace. Considering that the practical details of observatories are witnessed by comparatively few persons, and that of those so privileged still fewer can pick up anything like an intelligent idea of what is going on, and how the astronomical paraphernalia they

---

\* An accurate map of the grounds and buildings has been constructed and engraved by the present Astronomer Royal.

† Life of Flamsteed, p. 39, note.



behold are made to yield a knowledge of the facts which they read of in books at home; we have thought that an attempt might be made to make this branch of knowledge accessible to all who have any acquaintance with its elements, and to reveal some of the mysteries of the art and practice of an astronomical observer, to many who may never think of becoming either profound astronomers or practised observers themselves.

We propose, therefore, in the present article to consider, *first*, what it is which the practical astronomer professes to determine; *secondly*, to notice the instruments which he uses in order to make these determinations; and, *thirdly*, to attempt a sketch of the economy and management of an Observatory, its *personnel*, as well as its *matériel*,—which we shall illustrate by a more especial reference to the National Observatory of Greenwich. The two first heads we will make as brief as may serve to a due understanding of our third and principal topic.

I. Practical astronomy has two great branches. That to which the telescope may be said to have given birth; and that which is *comparatively* independent of it. Before the invention of the telescope, Copernicus had announced the true system of the world,—namely, that the sun is the centre of a planetary system, of which the earth is one member, with the moon circulating round it; and that the fixed stars are altogether independent and placed at a vastly greater distance. The periods and comparative distances of all the principal planets were known; as well as the deviation of the orbits of some of them from a circle; and a certain approximation was made to the singularly irregular form of the lunar path; eclipses could be calculated with tolerable accuracy; latitudes and longitudes roughly ascertained; and even such delicate phenomena as the apparent displacement of the heavenly bodies by refraction, and the general excessively slow motion of the fixed stars relatively to a point altogether imaginary, termed the *equinoctial point*, had been clearly discovered and imperfectly measured.

But when the telescope gave to man almost a new sense, and enabled him to examine objects at a distance, with the advantage of a vast magnifying power, a new department of practical astronomy arose. Astronomers had hitherto only seen the rude outline of our own system, and the still ruder landmarks of the starry firmament. The telescope not only revealed thousands, nay millions of bodies, hitherto unseen because invisible, but it displayed complications of arrangement and feature, which gave, as it were, a *colouring* to the broad natural outlines with which hitherto the astronomer had to content himself. The moons of Jupiter and Saturn, the rings of the latter, and the varying phases

of Venus and Mercury were, of course, among the first points of telescopic vision, — and a glorious insight they gave into the arrangements of our system. Then the actual physiognomy of the moon, the sun, and some of the nearer planets, after which the unaided eye could only vainly strain itself, and desire for more help, opened fresh fields of inquiry. More lately, the indefatigable study of the fixed stars and nebulae — with the aid of powerful instruments, and especially by the two Herschels, — has enlarged so prodigiously the boundaries of our knowledge and of rational and interesting speculation, that it is impossible to overrate the charms of this branch of practical astronomy. It has, however, been so fully considered in a recent article\* on Sir John Herschel's 'Observations at the Cape of Good Hope,' that we gladly abstain from further notice of it at present; desiring to concentrate the reader's attention on the department of practical astronomy cultivated alike by the ancients and moderns before and since the invention of the telescope, and which consists in the *measurement of space* with reference to the places of the heavenly bodies, and the comparison of those places with theory.

Whoever would record the positions of the heavenly bodies at any moment, and compare them (as regards their apparent movements relatively to one another) at some future time, must do so by referring them to certain lines or directions, which may be regarded as fixed and known.

The easiest reference is found by a comparison with that which is familiarly used to determine the position of places on the surface of the earth, or Latitude and Longitude. Though the terrestrial and celestial globes are not only different in their delineations (as a certain lady of fashion is said to have discovered, when she returned her globes to the maker because they were not *a pair*), but also in their *idea* or principle, the apparent place of a star on the celestial sphere may be defined by two angles, called Declination and Right Ascension, corresponding accurately to those of Latitude and Longitude, which determine the spot on the surface of the earth occupied (for example) by New York or Mont Blanc. Whirl a globe round its axis, and a pencil approached to the surface will touch all places having the same Latitude, — all stars having the same Declination. Stretch a thread tightly from pole to pole, and it will meet the position of all places on the surface having a common Longitude, and (on the celestial globe) of all stars having the same Right Ascension. The pencil mark will meet the thread but in one point; thus

---

\* Ed. Rev. vol. lxxxviii. p. 104.

the place is fixed completely by two angles, measured each from the centre of the globe along those circles;—the *zero point* of reference for Right Ascension being determined by a particular point called the Vernal Equinox, or the first point of Aries: Whilst on the terrestrial globe the Longitudes are measured from the meridian of Greenwich.

If we imagine the eye placed in the centre of a celestial globe, and the fictitious stars to be each pierced with holes through its surface, that eye would, if the globe were properly turned, see each star in the heavens through its appropriate hole. Such, in fact, is all the information which a celestial globe is intended to convey,—the idea of direction, or apparent place,—not at all that of distance. The moving lights of heaven,—sun and moon, planets and comets,—change, from day to day and from hour to hour, their seeming place. To be able to define accurately their apparent place at a given instant, is the first aim of the practical astronomer. This is done by ascertaining their Declinations and Right Ascensions,—the former being the apparent angular distance of a star from the celestial equator; the latter, the angle formed by the meridian (or line traced by the thread stretched from pole to pole and touching its place) with some other meridian, drawn arbitrarily or otherwise among the stars; just as in geography we, in Britain, refer the longitude of places to that of Greenwich. The astronomer, having traced the motions of an erratic star or planet on the apparent surface of the sphere, possesses the data for testing the truth of astronomical theories, whether of merely *formal* theories like those of epicycles and deferents (as they were called), or of *physical* theories like those of vortices and of gravitation. The apparent complication of these movements is in nature exceedingly great: consequently, the coincidence of *observed* with *predicted* places is the best test of theories; and thus the perfection of our observations becomes essential for the establishment of theories, especially of that greatest of Physical Laws hitherto detected by man—the law of Gravitation.

But the power of tracing with accuracy the places of the heavenly bodies on the apparent vault of the sky, and therefore with reference to one another, carries us a step further, even to the measurement of the impassable and seemingly illimitable spaces which divide them from us. We cannot indeed apply a rod or chain to measure the moon's distance, but we may do as those surveyors did who measured the height of Mont Blanc ere it had been ascended. Our earth, to be sure, is very small, compared with the spaces which separate from us even the nearest of the heavenly bodies, and a mere mathematical point as compared to the distances of the fixed stars. It is, however, so large that the moon,

for instance, is very visibly displaced as we regard her from one part of the earth or another. The direction of the earth's axis is a perfectly well ascertained line. If we look in its direction from any part of the earth's surface, the whole firmament appears to revolve round it by the diurnal movement; in this direction, then, a telescope may be accurately pointed. Let this telescope next be turned on the moon:—the angle which the telescope describes may be called the moon's north (or south) polar distance. If this experiment were performed *simultaneously* at Greenwich and at the Cape of Good Hope, the moon would appear further *north* from the latter than from the former station; for the same reason that if we go from the lower to the upper window of a house, the neighbouring chimney, which in the former case seemed to touch the distant weathercock, now falls far beneath it. Thus also, the moon when she passes centrally over a fixed star, as viewed by a spectator near the equator, will leave it uneclipsed to an astronomer in the Arctic or Antarctic Seas, passing to the south of it in the one case, and to the north in the other. This seeming displacement is called *parallax*. The greatest amount of parallax which the moon could possibly have, would be, if we imagine a spectator placed at either pole of the earth. The displacement to each, compared to the moon's position as seen from the earth's centre, would be about a degree, or the whole angle under which the earth's diameter (8000 miles) is seen at the moon, is two degrees.

In the same manner the parallax of the planet Mars and the planet Venus, when nearest to the earth,—and even the distance of the sun,—may be ascertained by observations made, *under favourable circumstances*, at different parts of the earth's surface: and since we are personally confined, by a physical necessity, to the surface of our globe, we can only make the best of the limits of voluntary excursion which Nature and Providence have assigned to us.

But though our voluntary perigrinations be confined to narrow limits,—although our globe is but a speck in space, and although a voyage from pole to pole would be, by the shortest route, but some paltry 12,000 miles,—fortunately for astronomy, we make an annual tour in the course of our orbital revolution round the sun, which carries us to two points of space nearly 200 millions of English miles apart. Seated on this comfortable railway carriage called the globe, we are actually tearing through space at the rate of nineteen miles *per second*, or 67,000 miles an hour; and the distance and position of the sun being known at any time by observation, the actual distance between the points of space occupied by us, the travelling spectators, on any two days, is accurately known. For instance, on

the longest and on the shortest day, our positions are, as we have said, nearly 200,000,000 miles apart. Of course this annual trip makes a vast change in the celestial scenery of the bodies nearest to us. The other planets, if they did not move themselves, would appear to do so by our own relative motion;—as it is, they have apparent movements, resulting from *their own*, as well as from our earth's orbital motions. But the most extraordinary fact is this: that, notwithstanding the vast space which separates the position of our earth at opposite seasons of the year, the scenery of the fixed stars is noways sensibly distorted by our change of place. The vast distance from the earth to the sun is seen from the nearest fixed star under an angle probably not exceeding *one second*—which is about *one two-thousandth* of that which the sun's or moon's disc subtends! This is called the *annual parallax*; and, admitting it to exist, the nearest fixed star must be 206,000 times more distant from the sun than our earth is; or 5,000,000,000 diameters of our globe, or about *twenty billions* of English miles!

Thus our knowledge of the distance of the fixed stars (the greatest to which the art of mensuration has yet extended) depends upon the diameter of the earth's orbit; which, again, is deduced from a triangle having the earth's diameter for one of its sides. But how is this last quantity determined?

The measurement of the earth was one of the most justly celebrated problems of antiquity. The science of *geometry* owes its name to this single application. We must refer to previous papers in this Journal\* for its history and solution. But we may observe that the fertile principle of triangulation is here, again, the basis of operation. At first, extensive though rude measurements of considerable spaces of the earth's surface were attempted. Norwood, about 1635, *guessed*, rather than ascertained, the distance from London to York, by measuring with a chain along the highway, allowing for its bends and obliquities, and sometimes merely by pacing. But the ingenious Snell made a better determination, by ascertaining a comparatively short distance by means of *exact* measurement†, and extending that measure, by a series of connected triangles, to a comparatively large portion of the meridian,—a process improved, in later times, by measuring a *second* base line near the close of the operation, and comparing it with the result of calculation carried forwards through the whole intermediate network of tri-

\* Ed. Rev. vol. v. p. 372.; vol. ix. p. 373.; vol. lxxxvii. p. 392.

† *Eratosthenes Batavus*, 1617. The measured base on which Snell ultimately depended was only 87 perches (of 12 Rhineland feet each), or about 1080 English feet. (Delambre, 'Hist. d'Astron. Moderne,' ii. 97.

angles. A coincidence of the calculated and observed results gives the very highest probability to the accuracy of the whole operation. From such an extended arc of the meridian the dimension of the whole globe is inferred, by reasoning which we cannot stop here to explain, but which in the simple case of the earth, being supposed truly spherical, is exceedingly easy and direct.

Now on these processes we have two remarks to make. *First*, that the operations of practical astronomy, as far as they regard the fixation of the distances and positions of the heavenly bodies, depend upon one single fundamental measurement of space, just as in surveying land with a Theodolite; — that measurement being the single measured side of the network of triangles which (rigorously speaking) is all that is required to measure an arc of the meridian, and consequently the axial diameter of our globe. Any error in that single fundamental linear measure is *proportionally transmitted* through all the succeeding calculations. The rod used in measuring a base line is commonly somewhere about ten feet long: And the astronomer may be said truly to apply *that very rod* to mete the distance of the stars! An error in placing a fine dot which fixes the length of the rod, amounting to *one five-thousandth* of an inch (the thickness of a single silken fibre), will amount to an error of 70 feet on the earth's diameter, of 316 miles on the sun's distance, and to 65,200,000 miles on that of the nearest fixed star! The *second* point to which we would advert is, that as the astronomer in his observatory has nothing further to do with ascertaining *lengths* as distances (except by calculation), his whole skill and artifice are exhausted in the measurement of *angles*; for it is by these alone that spaces inaccessible can be compared. *Happily, a ray of light is straight*; were it not so (in celestial spaces at least), there were an end of our astronomy. If we may be permitted a pleasantry on such a subject, it is our *beam* compass, and it is inflexible as adamant — which our instruments for ascertaining its position unfortunately are not. Now an angle of a *second* (3600 to a degree) is a subtle thing. It is an apparent breadth utterly invisible to the unassisted eye, unless accompanied with so intense a splendour (as in the case of the fixed stars) as actually to raise by its effect on the nerve of sight a spurious image having a sensible breadth. A silk-worm's fibre, such as we have mentioned above, subtends an angle of a second, at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet distance; a cricket ball  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches diameter must be removed, in order to subtend a second, to 43,000 feet, or about 8 miles, — where it would be utterly invisible to the sharpest sight, aided even by a telescope of some power. Yet it is on the measure of one single second that

the ascertainment of a sensible parallax in any fixed star depends; and an error of  $\frac{1}{100}$  of that amount (a quantity still unmeasurable by the most perfect of our instruments) would place the star too far or too near by 200,000,000,000 miles, — a space which light requires 118 days to travel.

The practical astronomer is not, however, constantly or principally employed in directly measuring the distances of the heavenly bodies, or the dimensions of the earth. The earth's diameter is now known with very great exactness, and the distance of the sun cannot become much better known, at least until the recurrence of the rare phenomenon called the transit of Venus. But the astronomer is engaged in ascertaining from time to time, with the utmost accuracy, the positions of the so-called *fixed* stars (which have *all* however, without exception, some small apparent motions), because these are the true landmarks of the heavens, to which the positions of all other bodies, sun, moon, and planets, are constantly referred; — and likewise in comparing the positions of those moving bodies, from time to time, with tables, constructed from the best existing theories of their motions, in order that such theories may be improved. The great usefulness of such improved theories will be seen in the course of the following pages.

II. We now proceed to give a general idea of the instruments used for ascertaining the position of a heavenly body in the sky, by means of the angles of Right Ascension and Declination, of which we have already spoken.

The ancients reckoned the right ascension of the heavenly bodies from that of a certain bright star in the constellation called *Aries*, which star nearly coincided with the position of the sun at the equinox of spring. There is at present no star in that place; yet astronomers know how to find the equinoctial points (as they are called) in the sky, and to reckon right ascensions from them, just as we count longitudes on the earth's surface from the meridian of Greenwich.

Imagine a straight and perfectly vertical wall built truly north and south, or in a plane coinciding with the earth's axis. A spectator looking carefully along one side of such a wall would observe at the same instant all celestial bodies, having the same right ascension, to pass out of sight behind the edge of the wall (in consequence of the apparent diurnal motion of the heavens), supposing that he looked along the eastern side; or to start simultaneously into view if he watched them at the western side. Their apparent passage across the plane of the wall may be called their *transit across the meridian*. Each successive hour, nay, almost every minute, will bring some new object to the same position

of passing the meridian; and since the diurnal motion of the stars is *absolutely* uniform, the intervals of their passages, measured by a good clock, will give a proportional measure of the angles between the meridians belonging to each object respectively. In fact, whether the clock go true or not, provided only that it go *regularly*, we have but to observe the interval of time between the passage of a star across the meridian and its return to it again; and considering that in that time the heavens must have made an entire revolution of  $360^\circ$ , we may by the rule of three find the angle corresponding to the intermediate place of any star whose time of transit by the clock has been noted. The entire period of revolution of the heavens from a star passing the meridian to its return, is called a *sidereal day*; one twenty-fourth of this is a sidereal hour, and so forth.

Now, if instead of merely *looking along* the side of a wall — an operation whose accuracy is comparable to that of observing the sun's shadow formed by the *style* of a common dial, and which is evidently the same in principle — we use a telescope with cross wires in its focus, and which is compelled to move always against this wall, we have a better kind of observation. If this telescope further carry with it an index which points to the angles of elevation, to which it is pointed at the instant that the star passes the meridian, the angles being drawn or engraved upon an arc of the quadrant, measuring degrees with the vertical, we ascertain the two determining angles or *coordinates* at the same moment; that measured by the time of the meridian passage or transit giving the *Right Ascension*, and the angle with the vertical (to which, when a certain angle is added, we have the angle with the direction of the earth's axis) giving the *North Polar Distance*. This method was due to Römer, or possibly to Römer and Picard jointly, and was practised by Flamsteed for thirty years, from 1689 till his death.

A method in some respects preferable consists in using two separate instruments for these determinations. At all events a good Transit Instrument (as it is called) cannot be made without allowing the telescope, which is to move strictly in the plane of the meridian, to be secured to a horizontal axis firmly sustained at both ends; and when this is done, *the meridian wall which we have supposed may be entirely dispensed with*. The transit instrument, the simplest and most effective of all astronomical apparatus, was the invention of Römer, an eminent Danish astronomer, about the year 1690.\* It was introduced at Greenwich by Halley, the second astronomer royal, in 1721, but

---

\* Horrebowii Opera, iii. 48.



was evidently but little known in England some years later, being described by the visitors of the Royal Observatory, in 1726, as 'a curious telescopic instrument.'\* Dr. Pound had, however, used one previously, which was probably the earliest in England. Halley's instrument is still preserved at Greenwich—5 feet long,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches aperture. The telescope is not attached at the middle point of the axis, an arrangement not easily to be accounted for. The transit instrument has three adjustments for placing it correctly in the meridian; but for an account of these we must refer to more special treatises. In modern instruments five or seven vertical and equidistant wires are placed in the field of view, so that the apparent passage of the star across all may be noted, and the average taken.

The Clock, one of the greatest of modern inventions, is the invariable and most essential companion of the transit instrument. The invention of the pendulum clock is somewhat obscure; but in the hands of Huygens and Hooke it first became practical, and this was only about the year 1657, or eighteen years before the foundation of Greenwich Observatory (August 10. 1675). The earliest English pendulum clocks (after those of Hooke) were probably by Tompion. Flamsteed had two—with pendulums thirteen feet long (beating two seconds), and they were wound up but once a year. He did not regard an error of ten seconds in the determination of time as excessive†; and when his clocks were out of order they would err as much as eleven minutes per day.‡ In Halley's time they were not much better. They had no provision for going during the time of winding; and the bob often struck the sides of the case, and thus altered the rate! A *journeyman clock*, to take seconds from the principal clock, having a loud beat, and probably striking a bell at the full minute, appears to have been used by Römer. But Graham, one of the most eminent of British artists, subsequently brought his timekeepers almost to a level, in point of performance, with those of the most recent times, as the clock rates in Bradley's time (1750) clearly show.§

---

\* 'Rigaud's Life of Bradley,' p. lxxii. A learned friend has remarked to us that 'curious,' in the scientific language of the day, meant 'accurate and delicate'; which is no doubt true. But we are entitled to infer that had the transit instrument been familiarly known at that time it would have been referred to by its own name. It was described as 'curious,' because it was really more accurate than the instruments then in common use.

† Baily's Flamsteed, p. 45.

‡ Ib. p. 114.

§ See 'Bessel Fundam. Astron.,' p. 91. Bradley's clock was made by Skelton, Graham's pupil.

For measuring altitudes (and hence polar distances) a divided brass arch of ninety degrees (or a quarter of a circle) has been in almost immemorial use. But though it may appear sufficient in theory for measuring all angles between the horizon and zenith, it is found to be practically much better to employ complete circles, divided from  $0^{\circ}$  to  $360^{\circ}$ ; whereby many errors arising from the imperfect division, the inaccurate centering, the flexure and the deterioration by use, of the instrument, are avoided. Circular instruments are most commonly confined to the meridian, the circle itself (like a wheel with spokes) turning along with the telescope, and its position being ascertained by six equidistant microscopes, used for noting the divisions engraved on the circle; they are fixed to the solid wall or pier, with which the circle is connected by a horizontal axis passing through the pier.

The *zenith sector*, as usually constructed, is merely a telescope of considerable length connected with an arc to which the movement of the telescope, carrying cross wires, may be referred for measuring the zenith distances of stars when that angle does not surpass a few degrees. Such a construction admits of the use of very long telescopes and proportionally large divisions on the *limb* or arch, which, being exceedingly short, is not thereby rendered unwieldy. It was by the use of such an instrument that Bradley made his celebrated discoveries of aberration and mutation. It is likewise an effective instrument for taking latitudes in trigonometrical surveys.

*Altitude and azimuth circles* are those which admit, by their construction, of taking elevations or zenith distances, not only in the meridian, but in any other vertical plane, whose inclination with the meridian or azimuth they likewise determine. They have advantages, especially as portable instruments, and where a consecutive series of observations in one spot, and for a lengthened time, is intended: they have likewise the important advantage of *reversion*, or the capacity of being used on the meridian with the face alternately east and west. But, on the whole, such instruments have been little employed in fixed observatories; partly from the difficulties of construction when the dimensions are very great, and partly from the labour of calculation indispensable for deducing the true place of a heavenly body from such observations. There have, however, been three great exceptions, in which excellent work has been done with the altitude and azimuth circle: — the five-foot circle at Palermo, made by Ramsden, and used by Piazzi for his catalogue of the stars; the eight-foot circle at Dublin (planned by the same maker) em-

played by Brinkley in ascertaining the small apparent motions of the fixed stars; and the recently-constructed altitude and azimuth circle used by Mr. Airy, at Greenwich, for observing the moon, as we shall presently mention.

The various instruments we have now described all require peculiar *adjustments* before they can be applied to any useful purpose. The transit instrument, and the circle or zenith sector must be capable, for instance, of being placed accurately in the meridian, and the telescope accurately adjusted to the zenith point, before right ascensions can be obtained by means of the one, or polar distances by the other. The limits and popular nature of this article forbid any attempt to enter into these important *minutiæ*; but the reader may find them very plainly and clearly expounded in Sir John Herschel's excellent elementary treatises on astronomy.\* We will only remark here, that the verification of the transit instrument is the more easy and simple; the determination of zenith points less direct, especially in instruments like the mural circle, which are incapable of being turned round so that the face of the instrument may be either *east* or *west* whilst the telescope is directed to an object on the meridian. But circles fixed to walls cannot be so used†; and the zenith and horizontal points are then very ingeniously determined, by observing a star alternately by direct vision through the telescope, and then as its image appears reflected from a basin of quicksilver. By a simple optical law the position of the telescope, exactly intermediate between the two observations, is the horizontal position.

But the north polar distance of a body may be inferred independently of a knowledge of the zenith point. The instrument called the Equatoreal telescope is arranged with this view. This

---

\* Some excellent practical information in a popular form may also be obtained from Captain Smyth's 'Celestial Cycle.'

† Bradley determined his zenith point by shifting his sector bodily from an east to a west wall; and this method was practised at Greenwich down to the time of Maskelyne; and the result was used for finding the index error of the quadrants. Bradley's skill is shown by the accuracy of his determination of the latitude of Greenwich when compared with the most recent results:—

	Latitude Greenwich.	
Bradley, from his annual observations	-	51° 28' 39½"
Bessel, from Bradley's obs.	-	51 28 39.6
Maskelyne ('Requisite Tables,' 1802, p. 199.)	51	28 40.0
Pond	-	51 28 39.0
Airy, from 5862 obs.	-	51 28 38.2

Flamsteed, in 1676, made it 51° 28' 10" by his sextant; but in 1690, 51° 28' 34" by the mural arc. (Baily, p. 346.)

052 FDF  
Vol. 91 (Pl. 2)

telescope is attached to a firm axis or shaft parallel to the earth's axis,—so that, as it revolves, the telescope follows the natural diurnal course of the stars. The *polar axis*, as it is called, is now generally connected with a piece of clock-work (of a peculiar construction, somewhat resembling that of a common *jack*, and without a pendulum; so that the motion takes place without jerks or starts of any kind\*), which causes the telescope to follow, spontaneously as it were, the motion of the object, and thus keep it always in the field. The right ascension is shown by an index connected with the polar axis, and pointing to an hour circle; the north polar distance by an index connected with the telescope itself. Owing to the inevitable tendency to flexure of the oblique-lying polar axis, and the intricacy of the adjustments, the equatoreal construction is never used for determining with *extreme* accuracy the places of celestial objects; but it is still most useful,—*first*, for ascertaining the places of comets and other erratic bodies which cannot always be seen on the meridian (and by comparing their transits across the wires of the telescope, in *any* fixed position, with that of known stars, their places may be very accurately estimated); and, *secondly*, for mounting powerful but unwieldy telescopes, when the divided circles become the readiest means of pointing such telescopes to given objects. The largest refractor in the world—that at Pulkowa, near St. Petersburg, made by Merz and Mähler, 14·93 inches aperture—is thus mounted; so are the great refractor of the Washington National Observatory, U. S., and the Northumberland Telescope, at Cambridge. Mr. Lassell, of Liverpool, has been successful in mounting a ponderous reflecting telescope, of two feet aperture, in the same way.†

III. Such, very briefly, are the principal instrumental means of making astronomical observations. We shall now say something of observatories and their arrangement; taking the National Observatory of Greenwich as our chief example, because one of the most extensive and most systematic in the world, the most important in its *past* results to astronomical science, and because naturally the most interesting to our readers.

---

\* The Equatoreal at Liverpool is moved by *water power*, the velocity being uniformly maintained by Sieman's ingenious regulator. In the more usual construction of equatoreal clocks, the friction of balls replaces the retarding action of the air's resistance in the common jack.

† Flamsteed's sextant was mounted with a polar axis merely for the convenience of directing it to the heavens. (See engraving in 'Historia Cælestis,' vol. iii.) Römer constructed a well-devised equatoreal instrument (under that name) in 1690. See Horrebow, *Opera*, iii. 39.

Observatories were originally little else than what their Latin name (*specula*) imports, — look-out towers raised above surrounding objects and low vapours. Galileo showed the satellites of Jupiter from the lofty campanile at Venice; and all the early observatories were built somewhat on the same plan. That of Copenhagen, for instance (founded in 1632), was 115 Danish feet in height, and 48 feet in diameter; a stair, or rather a spiral passage, led to the top, so that, as at Venice, it could be mounted on horseback, which the Czar Peter really did, and the empress Catherine in a six-horse coach! But far graver inconveniences than trees or fogs attended these lofty towers. The Danish astronomer, Römer, was so persecuted by the wind that he was glad to shelter his really useful instruments in his own house, where his principal observations were made. Finally, the Observatory having taken fire, the whole of the valuable manuscripts were destroyed in consequence of the inaccessibility of the building.

Römer was, perhaps, the most original and ingenious astronomer of his day. He was the discoverer of the progressive motion of light, and the undoubted inventor of the transit instrument. But, besides this, he designed and executed the first meridian circle with fixed microscopes, on a plan which appears almost unexceptionable, and which anticipated the ultimate progress of practical astronomy by more than a century. He also placed a transit instrument at right angles to the meridian, for the purpose of determining declinations as well as right ascensions by the use of the clock—a method, the beauty and value of which are only now beginning to be appreciated. Römer's little 'Tusculan,' or rural observatory, as described by his pupil Horrebow\*, is admirably contrived, with little show; and it was here that he made that three days' course of observations (*Tri-duum Roemerii*) 20—23rd Oct. 1706, which, owing to the fire already mentioned, has descended to us as almost the only relic of his observatory work. It consists of determinations of the places of the sun, moon, planets, and eighty-five fixed stars, and is truly, as Delambre has described it†, 'a work worthy to serve 'as a model.' The right ascensions were observed with all three wires of the transit instrument,—a precaution often neglected even by Bradley fifty years later. The piers of the instrument were blocks of fir wood, the axes were hollow cones of iron. We may here note, that observatories like that of Römer of small pretension, and in by no means favourable situations, have often

---

\* Opera, tom. iii. cap. xvi.

† Hist. Astron. Moderne, ii. 655.

produced greater results than national establishments, furnished at a lavish expense, but for ostentation rather than use; or, at least, abandoned to the care of indolent or mercenary guardians. Thus Catherine II. ordered for the observatory of St. Petersburg the finest and most expensive instruments which London artists (then the first in the world) could produce; but having done so, and filled the journals with announcements of her liberality and love of science, they were allowed to rust in their cases!\*. On the other hand, small private observatories, like Mr. Lassell's at Liverpool (in one of the worst climates in Britain), and Mr. Bishop's, at the Regent's Park, directed by the zeal of Mr. Hind—not to mention Sir William and Sir John Herschel's—have produced some of the most interesting, and, at the same time, most optically difficult modern discoveries. Captain Smyth's Observatory, described in his 'Cycle of Celestial Objects,' deserves mention as an excellent model for a simple private establishment, and his work as a useful guide to the amateur. 'A man may prove a good astronomer,' says Captain Smyth, 'without possessing a spacious observatory. Thus Kepler was wont to observe on the bridge at Prague: Schoeter studied the moon, and Harding found a planet, from a *gloriette*; while Olbers discovered two new planets from an attic of his house.'

The observatories of Paris, Milan, Bologna, and indeed of Greenwich itself, attest the formerly universal practice of giving to these edifices the form of a lofty tower with a flat roof.

The introduction of *fixed* instruments, — that is, of instruments that rest upon piers (like a transit), or are attached to stone walls (like a mural quadrant or circle), — necessitated a very different construction; and the principally effective part of most modern observatories consists of a range of rather low buildings running east and west, so as to contain but one chamber in breadth from north to south. Thus each apartment having a slit in the roof and two walls may command the zenith, and the north and south horizon. Revolving domes containing a slit, for the shelter of equatoreal telescopes, are often raised up to the second floor, the instrument resting upon a very solid pillar of masonry carried up from the ground.

A foundation of sand, clay, or gravel, has usually been preferred to solid rock, which is supposed to convey injurious tremors more readily to the instruments. The Edinburgh Observatory, however, which is built on a rock, through which there now passes at no great distance a railway tunnel, is stated

---

\* Delambre, Hist. Astron. Moderne, p. 620.

by Professor Smyth to be in no way injured by this seemingly untoward circumstance.

The National Observatory of Russia, at Pulkowa, about twelve English miles from St. Petersburg, is probably the most elaborately complete modern observatory, having been erected, with the usual liberality of the Emperor, at a cost of no less than 2,100,000 paper roubles, or about 80,000*l.* sterling\*, and endowed with a revenue of 2,500*l.* a year.

It consists of a great central building, nearly in the form of a cross, composing the observatory proper, with apartments for observation and computation. It is surmounted by a noble dome, which contains the Great Refractor,—the triumph of the Munich workshops. The special aim of this Observatory is Sidereal Astronomy. A smaller dome surmounts the east and west arms of the cross. Two extensive wings, containing the habitations and offices of the entire personal establishment, extend the imposing frontage, which is in the Grecian style, to more than 800 feet. It is the noblest edifice ever yet erected to the purposes of science. The personal establishment, under the able direction of M. Struve, includes fourteen, besides servants and ordinary workmen, and the families of all. The total number of inmates in 1844 was 103.† A most admirable scientific library, collected at a great expense, forms part of the outfit, of which an excellent and useful catalogue is to be found in the description of the observatory mentioned at the head of this article, and to which we must refer for further details, into which, unfortunately, our limits do not allow us to enter. Russia may indeed be justly proud of her Temple to Urania, and of the fame of Struve, her astronomer; yet, when we compare all this splendour with the humbler practical establishment of Greenwich, we feel that there is an amount of mere luxury in buildings, in instruments, in the unstinted supplies of an imperial treasury, which threatens, under a less energetic chief, to seduce men from the full performance of a most toilsome duty. Pulkowa is like the palace of an astronomical autocrat, who has but to *will*, and men and money appear at his call to take the heavens by storm. Greenwich resembles the counting-houses of some of our opulent city merchants, showing more brick than marble, but whose cellars are stored with the accumulated wealth of generations.

---

\* This includes 12,000*l.* for the cost of instruments entirely furnished from Germany.

† 'Description de l'Observatoire de Poulkova,' p. 54. The fourteen persons mentioned above include secretary, mechanist, pupils, &c.

The general position of Greenwich Observatory had been already described. The building consists of two very distinct parts; the *Old Observatory* having the usual tower form, (in this case octagonal from the first floor,) surmounted by a flat roof from which rise two small turrets; and this central tower is flanked by two wings, also of brick, and now capped with two small, revolving domes. This edifice, which is conspicuous in every view of the Observatory, faces the river Thames, coming forward to the very brow of the hill which it occupies. With the exception of the two small domes, it is *nearly* in the state in which it was constructed from Sir Christopher Wren's plan. Contiguous to it, on the south, is the dwelling-house of the Astronomer Royal, which has received several successive additions. The *New Observatory* dates, in its greater part, about a century back, and lies quite detached, and to the S. W. of the former building. It is comparatively low and unobtrusive. It is chiefly composed of a range of apartments running from west to east. There is a small revolving dome on the second floor near either end. The humble exterior of this, the really working observatory, will probably astonish any person who expects to view a great national edifice celebrated for the quantity and excellence of observations, of the most delicate kind, which have been made in it.

Charles II. founded Greenwich Observatory. It was the natural result of the tendency of the age to render speculative truth practical. Bacon, moved by the pervading spirit, had contributed more than any man to forward and extend the impulse he had himself received; and after the Restoration the physical sciences were in the very zenith of their popularity. Princes and bishops, statesmen and judges, courtiers, ladies, and poets, vied with each other, if not in extending the new philosophy, at least in celebrating its praises, and in attesting their sense of its importance. 'Charles himself had a laboratory at Whitehall, and was far more active and attentive there than at the Council Board.\* His patronage of the Royal Society (founded 1660, chartered 15th July, 1662) brought him into contact with men of science; and it was owing to an accidental discussion on a proposed method of finding the longitude at sea, by lunar distances, that the king became aware of the defective state of astronomy, and the important use to navigation of improved tables of the moon, and (as a first step to them) of accurate plans of the stars. This was early in 1675.† The foundation

---

\* Macaulay's 'History of England,' i. 409.

† See Flamsteed's Autobiography in Bailly's Life, pp. 37-8; but



of the Observatory was laid August 10th, 1675, the site having been suggested and plans given by Sir Christopher Wren: the roof was already covered in at Christmas. Sir Jonas Moore, Surveyor-general of the Ordnance, was particularly active about the matter: he had been connected with the Court as mathematical tutor to James, Duke of York, before the Commonwealth (1647), and had remained loyally attached to the Stuarts during their reverses. On his recommendation Flamsteed was appointed to the charge of the Observatory: his title in the warrant is 'our astronomical observator;' and his duty is 'to rectify the tables of the motions of the heavens and the places of the fixed stars, so as to find out the so much desired longitude at sea, for perfecting the art of navigation.' The same object is indicated in the inscription, which still stands near the old entrance of the Observatory, to the following effect:—

Carolus II., Rex Optimus,  
Astronomiæ et Nauticæ Artis  
Patronus Maximus,  
Speculam hanc in utriusque commodum,  
Fecit.  
Anno Dni MDCLXXVI. Regni Sui XXVIII.  
Curante Jona Moore milite,  
R. T. S. G.\*

Flamsteed held his office from 1675 to Dec. 31st, 1719, when he died at the age of 73. Few men have left so conscientious a record of a life of toil. Less skilled in the theory and construction of instruments than Römer, he yielded to no astronomer of his day in his ideas of the precision and diligence required in making, recording, and reducing observations; and his '*Historia Cælestis Britannica*' (posthumously published) will remain, to all time, an imperishable monument of the history of the heavens at the commencement of the last age. †

---

particularly Flamsteed's letter to Sherbourne, in the same work, p. 125.

\* These letters (as appears from the '*Historia Cælestis*,' vol. i. p. 26.) signify *Rei Tormentaræ Supervisore Generali*.

† Flamsteed's '*British Catalogue*' has been reprinted, with elaborate corrections and notes, by Mr. Baily. As a specimen only of its interest and importance to astronomy, we may mention that it contains six observations of Uranus—one in 1690, one in 1712, and four in 1715 (of course mistaken for a fixed star), which have been of great use in the Theory of Neptune. For further particulars of Flamsteed's career, see an article on his life in this journal, vol. lxii p. 359.

The liberality of the Government extended no further than to building the Observatory and giving the astronomer a salary of 100*l.* a year: which Flamsteed used to say (and truly) he earned by labour 'harder than thrashing.' But the strangest neglect was, that no instruments were provided for him. He had not only to thrash, but to *find his own corn*. Sir Jonas Moore, his kind patron, did indeed give him some instruments, namely, a large sextant, two clocks, and a telescope: but Government was deaf to his demands for money to construct others which he imperatively required, and which he eventually furnished from his own resources; so that at his death, not one article contained within the bare walls of the Observatory was the property of the Crown,—a circumstance which gave a colour to the right which he and even some of his successors assumed in the property of the observations which they made. Flamsteed at first had a common labourer assigned to him, at the public expense, to take care of the buildings and act as his servant; and somewhat later he appears to have been allowed a computer or assistant instead. In general, however, he had two regular assistants (who appear to have been engaged or apprenticed for a term of years), and one of whom was paid by himself, as well as spare computers in the country, whom he almost constantly employed in the reduction of his observations and in the comparison of the places of the heavenly bodies with the then existing tables. Most of the computations were made twice by independent persons and compared by himself.

In 1710, in consequence of the complaints of Newton and others as to the impracticability of extracting any information from the Astronomer Royal, the President of the Royal Society, and a selection of its members, were appointed by the Crown a commission of *visitors* to inspect the Observatory, and report its deficiencies to the Board of Ordnance, to purchase Flamsteed's instruments, to instruct the astronomer *as to the observations he should make*, and to cause him to return to them annually a copy of the observations when made.\* These summary powers were pretty regularly exercised. But no attempt was made to acquire Flamsteed's instruments for the State. On the whole, the appointment of the board of visitors was authorised by the circumstances of the time; and as in later years their powers have not been tyrannically exercised, the

---

\* 'Baily's Life,' pp. 90, 91. The warrant of Anne is dated Dec. 12. 1710. In the Secretary of State's letter to the Board of Ordnance they are required to 'have regard to any complaints the said visitors may make of the *misbehaviour* of her Majesty's astronomer.'

existence of the board has really been of great service to the Observatory, as we shall explain in speaking of its present state.

Flamsteed's really valuable observations commenced in 1689, when he employed his friend, Abraham Sharp, at an expense of 120*l.*, to construct for him the mural arc, which served to determine both the right ascensions and declinations of the stars of the '*Historia Celestis*,' as well as of the sun, moon, and planets.\* The divisions of the limb were estimated or subdivided by counting the revolutions of a screw at first†, and afterwards by diagonal divisions. It was 79½ inches radius. An arc of 5" could be distinguished upon it. The Greenwich Observatory has always been known in the neighbourhood under the familiar name of *Flamsteed House*, which indeed it still retains.

Flamsteed was succeeded in 1720 by Halley, long his keenest foe; who, being then sixty-four years of age, was certainly too old to execute properly the duties of so onerous a station; especially as he succeeded to the Observatory in a totally unfurnished state, and therefore had to wait, to have instruments made, before his observations could commence. In 1721 he procured a transit instrument, as already mentioned, and in 1725 Graham finished an eight feet mural quadrant, the best instrument of the time, with which Halley continued to observe the moon, until 1737, when he became paralytic, and died in 1742 (June 14th). His observations are preserved at Greenwich in the original MS., but have not hitherto contributed much to the progress of science, nor are likely now to do so.‡ Halley had no regular assistant§; a serious disadvantage, since the observations of right ascension and declination were now for the first time made with different instruments, which besides were placed at some distance apart.

Bradley, the greatest British astronomer of the past century, and, like Halley, Savilian Professor at Oxford, succeeded him February 3. 1742. He had already acquired deserved celebrity

\* The Czar, Peter, visited the Observatory twice in 1698. On the 8th March of that year, after a double observation of Venus on the meridian, is this note: '*Observante Serenissimo Petro Muscoviæ Czaro.*'

† This method, which would seem to belong to a more advanced stage of practical science, was due to Gascoigne, who first applied telescopes to divided instruments, and who constructed the first Micrometer. He died 1644.

‡ See Baily on Halley's Observations in *Astr. Soc. Mem.* vol. viii. p. 169.; and Rigaud on Halley's instruments in vol. ix. of the same work.

§ Baily's *Flamsteed*, p. 362.; Rigaud's *Life of Bradley*, p. li.

by his discovery of *aberration*, or the effect of the progressive motion of light combined with the motion of the earth in its orbit, in apparently displacing the fixed stars. This was followed in 1747 by his discovery (also by observation) of the inequality called *nutation*, an irregularity in precession, afterwards proved to be occasioned by the attraction of the moon on the elliptical protuberance of the earth's equator, producing a small conical motion in the position of its axis. In consequence of these two effects of gravity and the motion of light, combined with the long recognised phenomenon of the precession of the Equinoxes, all stars *appear* to describe (as seen from the earth) certain complicated little orbits, whose general period is a year, but which, not returning into one another, produce fantastical and not inelegant looped curves.\* So considerable, in some cases, are these apparent motions, that the stars (called *fixed*) require to have their apparent places computed beforehand just as the planets have, before any careful astronomical results can be deduced from observations compared with them. Thus in the 'Nautical Almanack' we have the place of *Polaris* calculated for every day, and many other stars for every tenth day of the year. These discoveries of Bradley were principally made by means of a zenith sector† (an instrument already described). It was  $12\frac{1}{2}$  feet radius, and he considered its results true to a quarter of a second. It was constructed for him by Hearn and Graham, in 1727, and used at Wanstead, in Essex, where he resided with his uncle Mr. Pound, known by his skilful use of the monstrous telescopes then in vogue for measuring the diameters of the planets and the elongations of their satellites.‡ Bradley's sector was removed to Greenwich on his appointment, where it was continually used by himself and his successors down to 1812. It is still doing good work at the Cape of Good Hope, and is illustrious from its long service as well as from the extraordinary value of the observations originally made with it. Considering a correct knowledge of the places of the fixed stars

---

\* Some of these are represented graphically in Captain Smyth's *Celestial Cycle*.

† The zenith sector, with a micrometer, appears to have been the invention of Hooke, and was used by him at Gresham College, in 1669, for ascertaining the parallax of the fixed stars. See Rigaud's 'Life of Bradley,' p. xii.

‡ Bradley himself, in 1722, measured the diameter of Venus with a telescope  $212\frac{1}{2}$  feet long! (Rigaud's Life, p. ix.) It should be noticed that the apparent orbit of  $\gamma$  Draconis was roughly made out, with Molyneux's sector at Kew, by Molyneux himself and Bradley, in 1725 and 1726.

(the landmarks of the sky) as the very foundation of accurate astronomy, it is hardly possible to overrate the practical importance of a discovery of the laws which regulate their apparently capricious motions: not to mention the beautiful physical induction of the cause, which afforded a *direct* proof of the motion of the earth in space, as complete as the annual parallax of the fixed stars which was then so anxiously sought for.

Bradley entered on his duties at Greenwich with the utmost vigour, although he still continued annually his lectures at Oxford. In 1743 he and his nephew, John Bradley (who acted as his assistant), made no less than 18,000 observations; *on one day* (8th August) they took 255 transits,—perhaps an unexampled effort.\* The instruments were Halley's, and they required much repair. It was not until 1750 that Bradley was provided with new instruments, excellent of their kind, through the liberality of George II., who granted 1000*l.* for this purpose, whereof 300*l.* was given to Bird for a new quadrant, and 73*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.* for a transit instrument by the same maker.† Bird made his quadrant every thing which so imperfect an instrument admits of being made. Its accuracy of division could scarcely be improved. It had a double arc—one of 90°, and one with 96 divisions (this number was first selected by Graham for the convenience of continued bisection of the arc of 60°, which was set off by making the chord equal to radius). By the comparison of the two arcs, contained in Bradley's printed observations, the difference rarely exceeds a second; and Mr. Pond admits, that, by his examination of the quadrant in 1811, the errors of division do not appear to be above that minute quantity, and the earlier observations with the instrument were in all respects perfectly good. By long use, however (sixty-one years), it had become gradually eccentric, and the error from this cause rose to 8" or 10" near the horizontal part of the limb.‡

With so admirable an instrument, and so admirable an observer, the results could not but correspond; and the commencement of true precision in astronomy really dates from 1750. The observations, however, were not printed until long after§, and they were reduced as regards the places of the fixed stars in an

\* Rigaud, p. liii.

† One of the most admirable instruments in the Observatory was the clock by Shelton. It bore Graham's name, and appears to have cost 39*l.* See Rigaud's 'Life of Bradley,' p. lxxiv.

‡ 'Greenwich Observations for 1812,' p. 234. This instrument is now in good preservation at Greenwich. He corrected the collimation by means of his zenith sector, which he removed from Wanstead.

§ By Dr. Hornsby, Savilian Professor at Oxford in 1798.

admirable manner by Bessel. The reduction of the Lunar and Planetary Observations, which are equally excellent and valuable, has only been performed within a few years by Mr. Airy; as will be mentioned in its proper place. Part, at least, of the range of building which constitutes the present working Observatory was of Bradley's time, and dates from the year 1749.

Flamsteed, we have seen, had a salary of only 100*l.* a year, which was farther reduced by official fees. Halley and Bradley had officially no more; but Halley received a personal addition of 100*l.* a year, in consequence of having served as commander in the navy.\* Bradley was offered the living of Greenwich, but conscientiously declined it, on account of the absorbing nature of his duties. In 1752, however, he received a pension of 250*l.*, which was added to the official salary of his successors by George III. The salary has, very properly, been of late years still farther increased.

Bradley's later efforts were successfully devoted to the improvement of the tables of the moon; and he died July 13. 1762, aged seventy. He was succeeded by his friend Dr. Bliss, the third in succession who united the posts of Astronomer Royal and Savilian Professor at Oxford; but he died in 1765, after holding the office of Astronomer Royal only three years, and without leaving any observations of such importance as to require especial mention.

Dr. Nevil Maskelyne, of Catherine Hall and Trinity College, Cambridge, succeeded Bliss, in 1765. He retained the office for the space of forty-seven years, and died Feb. 9. 1811, at the age of seventy-eight. At the time of his accession, more stringent rules were laid down by the Royal Society (the official visitors) for ensuring the habitual residence of the Astronomer Royal at Greenwich, and the complete devotion of his time to its increasing duties. Down to this period some doubt had even existed as to the right of property in the observations made at the National Observatory. Flamsteed's heirs, we have seen, claimed the papers in which were recorded his life-long labours as their property. Halley, who had always been clamorous for the public right in Flamsteed's observations, when pressed, in his turn, by the Board of Visitors, avowed his intention of keeping possession of his observations of the moon, that he might get the reward for the discovery of the longitude!† Bradley's observations were likewise retained by his heirs, and a

---

\* Caroline, Queen of George II., who visited the Observatory in 1727, obtained for him this advantage.

† His MSS. were ultimately purchased by the Board of Longitude for 100*l.*

law-suit, raised by the Crown, in 1767, to recover them, was abandoned in 1776. During Maskelyne's long tenure of office, he was entirely devoted to its duties, making himself all the most delicate observations, particularly those of the moon, and rarely quitting the Observatory, except to attend the meetings of the Royal Society. The perfect method and continuity of his observations give to them a great value, especially for the correction of the Lunar Tables, in which respect they are indeed without a parallel. But the regularity of their publication was not their least merit. Four large folio volumes include with perfect method the patient labours of a life (for he had but one assistant). Delambre, in his character of Maskelyne, says, that if through some catastrophe the whole materials of science should be lost except these volumes, they would suffice to reconstruct entirely the edifice of modern astronomy.

Maskelyne was drawn to the study of practical astronomy by the great eclipse of 1748,—which had a similar influence on the mind of Lalande. He was recommended by Bradley for observing the transit of Venus, in 1761, at St. Helena; and, though the primary object of the expedition was lost through cloudy weather, he made other valuable observations, especially for the determination of the longitude, both by lunar distances and by chronometers. With the same view he went afterwards (1763) on a voyage to Barbadoes with Harrison's timekeeper; and from 1767 to the time of his death he superintended the publication of the 'Nautical Almanack,' a work of infinite use to seamen, of which he edited no less than forty-nine volumes. In 1774 he made his memorable observations on the attraction of Mount Schiehallien, in Perthshire, for the determination of the earth's density; a work of great delicacy, which he executed under disadvantageous circumstances with consummate skill and address.\* With regard to the instruments employed by him, they were those of Bradley, with improved object glasses; but he had prepared for superseding the quadrants before his death. Troughton's Meridian Circle was ordered by him, although it was first used by his successor in June, 1812. On the whole, Maskelyne left behind him an enviable reputation. From a perfect devotion to the duties of his office, and a most candid and amiable temper, he was with equal justice both respected and liked by his contemporaries abroad as well as at home.

Mr. Pond, the next Astronomer Royal, resided at Greenwich from 1811 till 1835, when he resigned his office through the pressure of bad health, and died the following year. He had a

---

\* Phil. Trans. for 1775.

peculiar skill in the theory of instruments, and the correct interpretation and application of the results afforded by them.\* Himself the possessor in early life of a small but very perfect circle by Troughton, he published, as an amateur astronomer, determinations of the places of the fixed stars equal, if not superior, to those determined by public observatories; and demonstrated the increasing errors of the Greenwich Quadrant, due to the eccentricity occasioned by friction on its centre. This error is wholly avoided in circular instruments. At Greenwich he first used Troughton's Circle; and afterwards added Jones's, and made observations by reflection. He gradually increased the number of assistants from one to six—a most important innovation, rendering Greenwich Observatory capable of far greater efforts than his own infirm health enabled him to undertake, but of which full advantage has been taken by his successor.

The present Astronomer Royal, Mr. Airy, formerly Plumian Professor, and Director of the Observatory at Cambridge, was appointed to Greenwich in 1835, on the resignation of Mr. Pond. Before we proceed to give some account of his labours, which include, of course, the present operations of the Observatory, we will endeavour to give the reader an idea of its present state, or rather, to speak more accurately, its state until a few months ago, before certain alterations of an important kind were commenced, which we will briefly advert to in the sequel.

We have already stated that the Astronomical Observatory consists of two distinct groups of buildings,—the older castellated part, of the time of Flamsteed, and the low range, of Bradley's and Maskelyne's time: we shall commence with the former. It consists of a great centre tower and two wings. The tower in its lower part is occupied by the dwelling apartments of the Astronomer Royal. Its upper portion consists of a noble octagonal hall, with lofty windows, and balconies, intended for the use of large moveable telescopes and quadrants; but this room is not at all used now for such purposes. A narrow staircase leads from one of its corners to the leads on the top of the Observatory; commanding a very noble view over the whole of London, and a great part of the course of the Thames, and overlooking, of course entirely, Greenwich Hospital and its domes, as well as the town of Greenwich, and the cheerful slopes and deep woody recesses of the Park. Here are disposed several meteor-

---

\* Mr. Airy, in one of his Annual Reports, states that he regards Mr. Pond as the principal improver of modern practical astronomy. — *Report to Visitors*, 1846, p. 9.



ological instruments, which require a free exposure,—particularly Whewell's and Osler's self-registering anemometers, which record on paper the direction and quantity or force of wind during the twenty-four hours that elapse between each inspection of them.

Here, also, we find a singular mechanism surmounting the eastmost turret of the Old Building. It is a pole, with a weather vane and a large black cross arranged horizontally at the top. Below the cross, on the vertical stem supporting it, slides a black ball about six feet in diameter: it may be raised by a simple mechanism until its upper edge touches the arms of the cross, which prevent it from going higher; but in its ordinary state it remains down at the lower part of the staff. The object of this useful apparatus—called the *Time Ball*—is to give notice to the whole shipping of the Thames and port of London, of the exact time,—by dropping it daily from its highest position on the staff at the precise instant of One o'clock—Greenwich Time. The business of the assistant, who has charge of it, is, by means of a winch in the lower part of the observatory, to hoist up the ball to its highest position touching the cross *five minutes* before One o'clock every day, including Sunday. There is a time-piece compared with the Observatory clocks which stands near the winch, and also a species of trigger, by which the ball is suddenly detached and allowed to fall by its own weight, which is considerable. To prevent the shock of the fall from injuring the apparatus, the ball is connected with a piston eight inches in diameter, slipping in a cylinder containing air, which thus deadens the shock as by a cushion. The duration of the fall is immaterial to the observation. It has lately been proposed to observe the transit of the ball across several horizontal hoops; but the accuracy of the observation at present appears to be quite adequate to the end in view. At the instant of One o'clock the trigger is withdrawn, and the separation of the ball from the cross is visible to all the ships, which have chronometers on board; and they may thus have their errors ascertained, without the trouble and expense of sending them up to the Observatory, and the more serious drawback of the probable change of rate which the shaking of land carriage is almost sure to occasion. To check the possibility of error on the part of the time-ball assistant, another stationed in the Observatory notes the moment of the fall of the ball, and registers it daily in a book. The error in time does not usually exceed one tenth of a second; and does not amount to three tenths of a second oftener than once in six weeks.

In the western wing of the Old Observatory there is a dome,

under which was formerly an equatoreal telescope. The position being, however, unfavourable, the telescope has been dismantled and sent to the Cape.\*

Near this was (till lately) the Zenith Tube Room. This instrument is a modification of Bradley's zenith sector, for measuring small zenith distances (especially for the star  $\gamma$  Draconis, which passes within a few minutes (north) of the zenith of Greenwich), and it was intended, of course, to be an improvement on that celebrated instrument. It consisted of a tube twenty-five feet long, varying in diameter from six to ten inches, and furnished with a five inch object-glass at the upper end. The tube had no motion except round a vertical axis: zenith distances, therefore, were measured not by the motion of the telescope upon an arc, but by the observation with a micrometer of stars passing through the field. It is needless to describe its action more particularly; for all the skill of Pond and Airy, and all the mechanical dexterity of Troughton and Simms, failed to obtain any satisfactory results with this gigantic instrument. The errors of observation constantly amounted to 2" or 3"; exceeding those of the ordinary mural circle, and utterly destructive of any hope of measuring by this instrument the parallax of the fixed stars. This failure is an instructive example of the serious difficulty attending the construction and working of gigantic instruments, and the fallacy of the plausible expectation that *unlimited* accuracy may be obtained by mere enlargement of scale in our apparatus. Among other sources of error (difficult to foresee or avoid) the pertinacity with which spiders infest zenith sectors has been notorious ever since Bradley's time. These little animals, finding the dark, cool, undisturbed tube a desirable lodging, spin their threads there so assiduously as to entangle the motion of the plumb line, upon whose absolute verticality the accuracy of the instrument depends: and it is difficult either to perceive or remove them. The cunning spider, in thus perplexing astronomers, may be thought, perhaps, only to retaliate upon them for equal vexations which they have entailed upon the busy race of cobweb-spinners: since the very instrument in question, and almost every other in the Observatory, is provided with spider lines (technically called *wires*) in the eye-piece, for fixing the position of a star in the field of view of the telescope; and, to provide these, the optician is in the habit of training a certain kind of spider which furnishes the best thread for spinning long lines—to serve his own ends, not theirs, to catch stars, not flies:—*Sic vos non vobis!*

The zenith tube having been found ineffectual, is now dis-

mounted, and the apartment otherwise appropriated. Mr. Airy has, however, devised an altogether new instrument for the same purpose, in which the principle of reflection at a quicksilver surface is to replace the clumsy and inaccurate plumb line; but the particular contrivance we can hardly hope, within our limits, to render intelligible.

In the eastern part of the old building, and near the trigger apparatus of the time ball, is an equatoreal telescope by Ramsden, known as Shuckburgh's Equatoreal. It is not, however, much used, since a larger instrument of the same kind has since been added to the establishment.

We now enter the Observatory Proper, at its west end (which also communicates, by means of a covered passage, with the astronomer's house), and we first find ourselves face to face with that fine old brazen quadrant by Bird, eight feet radius, mounted on a pier so that the telescope points to the southern meridian, and which furnished the admirable declination observations of Bradley and Maskelyne. It is in all respects preserved as when in use, although now of course never employed, —being superseded, since 1812, by the mural circle. On the west face of the same stone pier, the east side of which is occupied by Bird's quadrant, is Graham's old iron quadrant: it was made for Halley, but was redivided by Bird for Bradley, who used it for his earlier observations, and also for his later ones north of the zenith. As this instrument is little more than a venerable curiosity, the present astronomer has ingeniously managed, without injuring or removing any part of it, to convert the little room connected with it into a fire-proof room, for the preservation of the valuable MSS. connected with the Observatory: they include a complete set of all the astronomical observations made at Greenwich. Here we have Flamsteed's voluminous MSS., many of them first brought to light and carefully arranged and bound by the indefatigable care of Mr. Baily: and also Halley's rather confused memoranda (never printed) of his tenancy of the place. Of Bradley's observations there is only a MS. copy taken from the originals in the Bodleian, under Mr. Airy's inspection. It may be regretted that the trustees did not think themselves entitled to surrender the MSS. themselves, to which the public have evidently an equitable, if not an undeniable legal, right. Of course Maskelyne's and Pond's MSS. are found here, and there are now carefully preserved the *jotting books* with indelible metallic pencil writing, in which each individual observation is at the time noted by every observer in the establishment. The correspondence of the Astronomers Royal, as far as collected, is also here preserved.

The next room, to the eastward of Bird's Quadrant, is the COMPUTING ROOM,—the grand scene of labour of the whole Observatory. It is only by exception that the astronomer or his assistants are to be found *using* the instruments, even during the regular hours of observatory work; but they are nearly sure to be found assembled in the Computing Room, busied, at different tables, with their silent and laborious tasks,—the assistants on watch turning an eye now and then to a small time-piece, which regulates their task of allowing no celestial object of consequence to pass the meridian unobserved. When we come to speak of the personal establishment of the Observatory, we shall try to explain how it is that the calculating work is so much more heavy than that of observation.

Next in order comes the TRANSIT ROOM. The instrument which gives the room its name has been already explained. The Greenwich transit is ten feet in length,—the object-glass by Dollond, the mounting by Troughton: it was set up in 1816. The eye-piece contains seven vertical 'wires' (in reality spiders' threads); and the time of passage of each celestial object over every one of these is noted, and the mean taken. The mean or average direction of the whole seven wires determines the ideal line, called the 'line of collimation,' or optical axis of the telescope. If any of the wires have been missed by accident, a table is provided, by which the mean result, with those actually observed, may be reduced to the ideal mean. Suspended from the roof, above the instrument, we observe strong braces and pulleys of formidable appearance, recalling the instruments of torture of which traces may still be found in some ancient prisons. An apparatus of question no doubt it is. The telescope, if suspected of wavering by a hair's breadth from the meridian line of truth, is forthwith seized and pinioned by the assistants; and, its unwieldy mass having been lifted by main force from its piers, it hangs dangling in the air, until, having been swung horizontally round, it is allowed to seek repose again in its Y's, the ends of the axis having been reversed in position. If the line of sight (or collimation) be correct, the meridian wire will fall on the selfsame spot as before. Should it deviate from the expected place—deviate, though 'but in the estimation of 'a hair'—but a single second, the very brass of the telescope would blush a copper red! We shall say no more here of the verifications of the transit instrument, save that there is a meridian mark at Chingford, on the Essex hills, placed, in 1824, by Mr. Pond. As there is no doubt that it was *absolutely* in the meridian at that time, it may be interesting hereafter to verify the perfect persistance of the direction, on the earth's surface,

of the N. and S. line; that is, the constancy of the axis of rotation of our globe.\*

Beside the transit stands, of course, a clock. This one is by Hardy, an eminent maker, who died now many years since; and it has been, in part, remodelled. Its performance is quite satisfactory; by which we mean, not that it never goes sensibly wrong, but that its rate (*gaining* or *losing*) is constant, or nearly so, for many days together, so that its error may be at any time allowed for. The most fundamental of all the observations is the knowledge of *time*. Now the mere error of observation with a good transit instrument, when seven wires are observed, is not perhaps  $\frac{1}{20}$  of a second of time: hence only the very best determined objects can be employed for determining the clock error. Such are called *clock stars*,—the sun himself being never used for this purpose,—since the errors of the solar tables (or of the theory of the earth's motion) are still sensible. A consequence from this is, that the astronomical clock does not indicate the time from noon, or the sun's passage. We are surprised to see an observatory clock pointing to eight or twelve o'clock when we know that it is four o'clock by St. Paul's; and still more—going, a few months after, at the same hour—to find that the clock is giving totally different information. We are apt to think that the astronomers are so taken up with dividing a *second*, that they lose count of the *hours*. But the fact is, that the astronomical clock is regulated by the stars, not by the sun, and shows what is called *sidereal time*. Its twelve o'clock, or noon, is when the equinoctial point (in Aries) is on the meridian; and, as a matter of course, the clock at any moment tells what part of the circle of right ascension is on the meridian; and, conversely, by noting the moment of transit of a celestial object, its right ascension becomes known without any calculation. Our civil reckoning is regulated, very reasonably, by the sun, because daylight determines the order of our occupations; but the astronomer knows no such distinction; and the sun is to him merely an object having such and such a right ascension on a particular day, and to be observed in course among the others.

The mode of making a transit observation is as follows:—

---

\* Mr. Pond used this meridian mark with the aid of a collimating telescope on the south of the transit instrument, to ascertain the line of collimation in azimuth without the necessity of reversing the instrument. (See Greenw. Obs. 1832.) As we have spoken above of the *absolute* coincidence of the line of collimation with the meridian, we should add that the astronomer does not aim at this, but allows, by calculation, for the small deviation which he ascertains.

The assistant in charge of the transit instrument is warned, by his sidereal timepiece approaching the hour which corresponds with the right ascension of the object he is to observe, that he is to prepare for the observation. The shutters of the slits in the roof are probably already open. If the object be the sun, the telescope is protected, by a screen near the object-glass, from the direct rays: for so sensitive is this instrument to unequal temperature of its parts producing a deviation of its axis, that the approach of a man's body to one side or other will twist the line of collimation: hence, transit instruments are often cased in flannel. Having adjusted the telescope to the anticipated altitude of the object in the meridian, by means of a small circle attached to it for this purpose, he seats himself in a very comfortable chair with a reclining back, similar to that in which most of our readers have reclined in a dentist's room. The observing-chair rolls back or forward at a touch by means of a railway which follows the eye end of the telescope, whilst the observer keeps his head supported by means of the adjustable back aforesaid. When the object is *high*, the observer is *low*: if the object be a star in the zenith, the observer lies almost on his back; and, in this very agreeable posture, he might surely be excused for indulging in a nap! We have not ascertained whether the code of laws of the Observatory contains a punishment for so dreadful an offence. Be this as it may, taking an observation is no sleepy matter; the tremble of impatience for the entrance of the star or planet into the field of view, is like that of the sportsman whose dog has just made a full point, and who awaits the rising of the game. When the star appears, the observer, in technical language, *takes a second from the clock face*; that is, he reads the second with his eye, and counts on, by the ear, the succeeding beats of the clock, naming the seconds mentally. As the star passes each wire of the transit, he marks down in his jotting book, with a metallic pencil, the second, *and the second only*, of the observation, with such a fraction of a second as corresponds, in his judgment, to the interval of time between the passage of the star and the beat of the clock which preceded such passage. This interval may be estimated either by the judgment of the ear or of the eye. In the latter case, the observer registers in his memory the position of the star relatively to the wire at the preceding and following clock-beat, and subdivides the space mentally.\* Before Maskelyne's time, the second was only rudely divided by certain signs of *less* or *more*; but, since 1772, the transits have been noted in decimal frac-

---

\* This was Bradley's invention. Rigaud's Life, p. lv.

tions of a second; and an experienced observer will never commit an error exceeding  $\frac{1}{10}$  of a second on each of the seven wires. The observer then carefully takes the hour and minute from the clock, and adds it to the *last* observation. Stars not very near the sun may be seen and observed with the telescope in broad daylight,—an effect of optical power not altogether easy to account for, and deserving of farther investigation by experiment. At night, the field of the telescope must be enlightened by a lamp shedding a ray through the transverse axis, so that the spider threads may be distinguished against the brighter ground.

The observations with the transit instrument have two distinct purposes: *first*, the determination of *time* from objects whose right ascension is known (clock stars); *secondly*, the determination or correction of right ascension of objects from the true time of passage across the meridian. The clock stars themselves have had their places ascertained in this manner, and cannot be regarded as ever *perfectly* known. When less than four such stars (taken from a list including about sixty principal stars, none of which are less than  $50^\circ$  from the pole, so that their passage across the meridian shall be nearly as rapid as possible) are observed on the same day, their mean result is taken, to give the clock error; but when more than four are observed, the clock error being similarly ascertained, the right ascension of the individual stars thus used is also calculated and entered in the Reduced Observations; because it is concluded that our knowledge of the differences of the right ascensions of these bodies will be perfected by such an observation, and in the long run (being carried from star to star round the heavens) will correct the very individual places whose *collective* accuracy was assumed in the determination of the clock rate, — on the knowledge of which the accuracy of those intervals evidently depends. Thus astronomers do really in one sense reason in a circle; but yet have reason on their side,—for it is evident, on consideration, that the accumulation of good observations of well determined stars will tend to annihilate the effect of the error of place of any one or two stars upon the clock-rate, and at the same time bring out the discrepancy in the right ascension of those particular stars.

But we now pass to the CIRCLE ROOM. Here, in 1812, was mounted the masterpiece of Troughton—the six feet mural circle for ascertaining the altitudes of celestial bodies on the meridian, and thence their polar distance. A second similar one by Jones, for observations by reflection, was mounted in 1824; but Mr. Airy having, by a particular method, which he

adopted at Cambridge, been enabled to obtain as satisfactory results with one circle as with two, Jones's circle was sent, in 1839, to the Cape, where it still remains. The circle is provided with six equidistant microscopes, fixed to the stone piers in such a manner that, when the circle is turned on its axis, the divisions on it pass rapidly through the field of view of these microscopes, which are also provided with fine spider lines whose motions are ascertained by counting the revolutions of a screw ; and thus the subdivisions of the spaces on the divided circle are ascertained to great nicety, the mean of the readings of which not only effectually destroy any error of centering (which vitiated the old quadrant observations), but in almost every possible case correct casual errors of division.

It is in contemplation to supersede both the mural circle and transit instrument by a transit circle (now in preparation), with which is connected a telescope of very large dimensions.

Beyond the Circle Room are three apartments devoted to the assistants ; and ascending a narrow stair, we find, first, a comfortable and well appointed LIBRARY of Astronomical and Scientific works, carefully arranged, catalogued, and bound, which are used exclusively by the persons connected with the establishment. The present Astronomer Royal, who has added greatly to the efficiency and completeness of the library, states that it has been found to be most useful in diffusing a taste for science among his subordinates, and in enlarging the circle of their acquirements.\* Several hundred pounds have been judiciously applied by the Admiralty to this desirable object.

Adjoining to the library is the CHRONOMETER-ROOM. On entering, the visitor is startled by a universal buzz, which sounds almost like the hum of the beehive. It is occasioned by the beats or *ticking* of many rows of chronometers, the property of the Admiralty, or of individual makers who have sent their watches on trial, prizes being occasionally awarded to the most perfect, besides that those found to go most regularly are always purchased for the public service. Two broad shelves on three sides of this room are usually covered with these delicate and valuable machines, whose aggregate worth is never under several thousand pounds. In 1842 there were no less than one hundred and seventy chronometers on trial ; at present there are not so many. They are *rated* for the most part daily, and by two persons, to avoid error. The whole process is

---

\* Astronomer Royal's Report, 1837, p. 2. Again (1846, p. 3.) he says, 'The library is accessible, under simple regulations, to all the assistants, and is producing a marked effect upon their education.'



curious enough. At one o'clock every day the two assistants in charge repair to the room, where is a timepiece set to true time. One person opens the lids of the chronometers (which are almost all in boxes), and winds up each with its own key. His second follows a little after, verifies the fact of each being wound up, and closes the lids. The object of this is to still the din of ticking, which would prevent the clock-beats from being distinctly heard in the comparison. One assistant then takes each watch in succession in his hand, and, reckoning by the eye a second from the clock-face, counts the beats whilst he compares the chronometer by the eye, and in the course of a few moments he calls out the *second* shown by the chronometer when the clock is at 0 second. This number is registered in a book by the other assistant, and so on throughout. They then change places, the second comparing, and the first writing down; but this last precaution is sometimes omitted. The *minutes* are compared with the clock but once a week. From these books of daily comparison are deduced the daily rates by which the goodness of the watch is to be estimated. The errors are chiefly of two classes,—that of general bad workmanship, producing a *lawless* variation in the rate, and that of *over* or *under*-correction for temperature (or *compensation*, as it is called,) which may occur even in a watch otherwise perfectly well made. The difference of the greatest and least rate in the course of a twelvemonth, when the watch has been exposed to all the annual changes of temperature, may be ascribed principally to the latter fault; but abrupt changes, shown by comparing one week's mean rate with the next, are considered to be due chiefly to indifferent workmanship. A chronometer is judged of on the whole by a combination of these two tests; yet it is easily seen that such combination is in a great measure arbitrary, and that the selection of a chronometer must depend a good deal on the particular service for which it is to be used. If, for instance, it is to be sent to extreme climates, the perfection of the temperature correction will be most regarded. We must add, that in the middle of the apartment is a stove, and over that stove a large iron tray or pan, which may justly be termed *purgatory*. Here the chronometers, doomed to the highest trials of virtue, do penance for a period in artificial heat, and, when their rates have been taken, are plunged in snow; thus made to

‘——— feel by turns the bitter change  
Of fierce extremes—extremes by change more fierce;  
From beds of raging fire to starve in ice  
Immovable, infixed, and frozen round  
Periods of time; thence hurried back to fire.’

The great care and attention which all chronometers sent on trial to the Royal Observatory invariably receive, as well as the perfect impartiality and authenticity of the reports on their performance, afford great encouragement to this branch of national manufacture—one of vast importance to the safety, convenience, and perfection of navigation. But, notwithstanding the astonishing rapidity with which, by long practice, the comparisons are made, the detail of the chronometer department of the Observatory is a very heavy one, and, in fact, occupies no inconsiderable fraction of the strength of the establishment.\* The service thus conferred on navigation is too direct, and is too closely connected with the primary objects of the Observatory, to be given grudgingly; it must be, however, recollected, that so much power is withdrawn from strictly scientific work, and that no part of the chronometer-work appears in the ‘Greenwich Observations.’

Near the chronometer-room is the SOUTH-EAST DOME, occupied by a fine equatorially mounted telescope. The object-glass was munificently presented to the Observatory by Mr. Sheepshanks; it is  $6\frac{3}{4}$  inches in diameter. This instrument is valuable for ascertaining approximately the places of comets, &c., out of the meridian; and, being fitted with a double-image micrometer, contrived by Mr. Airy (described in ‘Greenwich Observations,’ 1846, p. lxxxvii.), can be used for ascertaining the distances of double stars, the diameter of planets, &c. But these observations are only occasional, not systematic, in this Observatory.

There is another dome connected with these buildings, which is entered by a small stair close to Bird’s Quadrant (see p. 328.), but which we have hitherto purposely abstained from mentioning, in consideration of its being occupied by an instrument expressly intended to be supplementary to those already described. This is the ALTITUDE AND AZIMUTH, or south-western DOME; it is on the second floor of the ‘advanced building,’ formerly spoken of as the site of Flamsteed Mural Arc. We have alluded to the inconveniences attending the use of altitude and azimuth instruments, such as those of Palermo and Dublin. But Mr. Airy considered the special advantage to be derived from observing the moon in parts of her orbit when, on account of the sun’s proximity, she is invisible in meridional instruments, to be worth the trouble

---

\* In 1842, Mr. Airy stated that the chronometer work occupied the greater part of the time of three assistants. We must, in strict accuracy, add that it is not *usual* to expose the chronometers to the action of frigorific mixtures; but they are sometimes employed when the makers desire it. See *Parliamentary Return on Admiralty Chronometers*, 28th July, 1849.

and expense of constructing a circle with extraordinary precautions for stability, and of undertaking calculations, of great length and intricacy, for deducing the moon's place at such times. The extraordinary pains with which for more than one hundred and seventy years the moon's motions have been followed at Greenwich, and the happy result, in the improvement of the Lunar Tables, as well for the use of navigators as for a test of the theories of physical astronomy, have given to the British National Observatory an undisputed preeminence in this department. As the greater part of the lunar irregularities depend in some way or other upon her position in regard to the sun; and as the moon scarcely ever can be observed on the meridian when her time of passage is within four hours on either side of the sun, it is easy to see that nearly one-third of her orbit (relatively to the sun) is unobserved and untested. It was to supply this defect that Mr. Airy recommended and effected the erection of this instrument, which is of singular solidity, with horizontal and vertical circles three feet in diameter. By a comparison of the moon's place with that of well ascertained stars, *in any part of her diurnal course*, observations may be made in the early morning, or in the evening, when the moon is a slender crescent, and the sun below or only a little above the horizon. Besides this, observations of the moon's place may at all times be obtained when the weather permits, although it may have been cloudy at the instant of her passing the meridian. The observation is made by the method of comparative transit of the moon and a fixed star, both across six vertical wires for azimuth (the horizontal circle being fixed), and six horizontal wires for altitude. The results are satisfactory in quality, being little inferior to those with meridional instruments; and they have increased the number of lunar places ascertained during the year by 75 per cent., and include observations of the moon even within *one hour* of the sun. It may be thought to be a great sacrifice of time and labour (absorbing the strength of one assistant at least) for a single object, the cost being at first 700*l.* or 800*l.*, and 150*l.* per annum afterwards. But on this subject Mr. Airy gives us the curious information, that the lunar observations, as previously conducted, might be considered to cost the country 1000*l.* a year, or *each single complete determination of the moon's place to be worth 10*l.*\**

This completes our survey of the Astronomical Observatory. We have only space to glance for a moment at a subordinate department, which some of our readers will perhaps consider the

---

\* Airy, Report, 1844, p. 5.

more interesting of the two,—the MAGNETICAL AND METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY. We regret that it is impossible for us here to do more than meagre justice to this subject.

A knowledge of terrestrial magnetism has always been most intimately connected with that of navigation, and in some measure, also, with astronomy,—meteorology little less so. The diurnal variation of the needle—the most important discovery next to its polarity and variation—was ascertained by Graham, the clock and quadrant maker of the Greenwich Observatory in the time of Halley. Bradley made observations of the same kind; and so, occasionally, did Maskelyne and Pond. About fifteen years ago, however, a grand revolution was made in the science of terrestrial magnetism, chiefly by M. Gauss, a celebrated German mathematician and astronomer, who had the rare merit at once of inventing instruments capable of ascertaining variations in the force and direction of the earth's magnetical attraction, with a precision resembling the results of astronomy; and likewise of showing how these results, obtained simultaneously over a large part of the earth's surface, might be combined and connected, by mathematical formulæ, in such a manner as to represent, in an accurate and continuous manner, all the phenomena of magnetism at any point of the globe which might be selected, and so to register their changes from age to age.

Although Britain had not the honour of starting first in the magnetic race, yet she very speedily and honourably vindicated the position which her national consequence and widely-spread colonial territories strongly pointed out for her. Of course a *home* observatory—as complete, at least, as those equipped for Canada, St. Helena, the Cape of Good Hope, the East Indies, and Van Diemen's Land—was to be provided; and Mr. Airy at once volunteered to render Greenwich Observatory as effective in the magnetical as it has always been in the astronomical department. In 1838 a magnetic house or observatory had already been erected within a considerable enlargement to the southward of the old enclosure. After the usual number of official difficulties and delays, this appropriation on behalf of science was sanctioned by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests and the Ranger of the Park. It would be fortunate, if all encroachments on the pleasure-grounds of the public could be so well accounted for. The edifice is of wood, in the form of a cross with equal arms, the general directions being *magnetic* N. and S., and *magnetic* E. and W. It required only additional instruments (for occasional observations had been regularly made from 1838 until 1840, the period of which we now speak), and proper

assistance, to make the Magnetic Observatory all that could be desired. Besides magnetic bars, variously suspended, a complete system of barometers, thermometers, wind and rain measurers, hygrometers, actinometers, electrometers, and all other *ometers*, were gradually but efficiently provided; and last, not least, a sufficient staff of observing assistants was attached to the already considerable establishment of the Observatory. Their duty, indeed, was not light,—more irksome even than that of the practical astronomer; for here the observations must be made, be the weather what it may, every two hours, day and night, from year's end to year's end, with the sole exception of the twenty-four hours of Sundays. These observations were of a kind which was then new and nearly untried; the instruments had to be proved and adjusted in a thousand different ways before any thing like the same confidence could be had in their use which for generations had attended the operations of astronomy. The calculations and reductions to be gone through were so extensive, that, in consequence and for a series of years, Greenwich Observatory has given to the world two thick quarto volumes of results instead of one,—doubling, at least, the labours of the Astronomer Royal himself, although he generously neither required nor accepted any addition to his official income on the occasion.

This cross-like building, then, contains three principal instruments, or suspended magnets, disposed so as to influence as little as possible one another's motions. We have first a horizontal bar, suspended by a long bundle of silk fibres, which shows the change of direction of the magnetic north (declination or variation) at any moment. We have, in the second place, a magnetic bar, twisted—by means of the lines which suspend it—away from the magnetic meridian, so that it hangs nearly E. and W.; but, as the magnetic force of the earth increases or diminishes a little from time to time, the north end is a little more pulled to the north, or a little relaxed,—so that the *horizontal force* of the earth's magnetism is measured by the arc described by the needle thus balanced between the opposing forces of torsion and attraction. Thirdly, we have the instrument for measuring the vertical magnetic force, which resembles the beam of a pair of nicely-poised scales,—itself magnetised,—but without any scales attached. The northern end of the beam tends to dip more when the attractive action of the earth, by any cause, increases: on the contrary, when it diminishes, the counterpoise on the S. end of the bar tends to make it rise.

Each of these instruments is furnished with a small, flat mirror (or something equivalent) which turns as they turn. But every one knows that if we turn a looking-glass slowly

round with the hand, fixed objects reflected in it appear to wheel about with a redoubled velocity. Gauss availed himself of this principle to watch the *seeming* displacement of a finely-divided scale of inches, viewed, by means of a telescope, as reflected from these moving mirrors; and thus, by an easy calculation, to infer the angular motion of the magnetic bars to which they were attached. The magnetic observers were then required to register, every two hours, the division of the respective scales which they saw reflected in the mirror of each instrument; and these *readings* were at leisure converted into measures of the changes which it was wished to record; namely, of the declination or variation, in minutes and seconds of a degree, and of the horizontal and vertical components of the earth's magnetism, in thousandths of the whole force.

These important and vastly numerous determinations having been corrected, as far as possible, for the index errors of the instruments, and for the effects of temperature on the magnetic force of the bars, have been regularly printed in the supplementary volume of the Greenwich Observations. But as it became evident that something like a perpetual registration of magnetic instruments must henceforth form part of the work of a National Observatory, the attention of scientific men has for some time been directed to the possibility of causing the instruments to record their indications in the absence of the observers, and thus save a vast amount of severe human labour and vigilance. Government was induced to offer a reward of 500*l.* for such a perfected system; and Mr. Brooke, a medical gentleman of London, has been fortunate enough to adapt the principle of *photography* to it with such success as to be fairly entitled to the reward. His method has now superseded entirely the system of day and night watches so long pursued at Greenwich. We can only very briefly indicate the process.

It has been seen that the mirrors attached to the magnets reflect the divisions of a scale of inches to the right or left, as the magnets move one way or other. Instead of the scale of inches, imagine a lamp continually throwing a narrow ray of light on the mirror in a fixed direction. As the magnet moves, the ray reflected from the attached mirror will turn to one or the other side, and the spot of light which it throws on a screen placed so as to receive it will travel over a greater distance in proportion as the screen is placed farther from the reflecting mirror. Thus, without the smallest friction, we have a spot of light moving over a space which represents, upon any desired scale, the angular motion of the magnet. But now let the surface on which the spot of light shines be of photographic paper, placed in an apartment otherwise dark; let it envelope a

cylinder turning round a horizontal axis once in twelve or twenty-four hours, and the path of the luminous spot, from instant to instant, will be recorded by a discolouration of the sensitive paper. This impression is then made permanent, by the usual process, and the papers being removed are preserved as perpetual records of the continuous fluctuations of the several magnets. To give an idea of the scale on which the registrations are made, we may state that  $1^{\circ}$  of the declination magnet covers five inches of the photographic scale (corresponding to a circle of twenty-four feet radius); a variation of one thousandth part of the horizontal component of the earth's magnetic force causes a deviation of the spot of light through twenty-four hundredths of an inch on the paper; and a similar variation in vertical force produces a motion of fifty-two hundredths of an inch. The photographic indications are checked by means of four or five readings of the instruments, made daily at convenient hours, according to the old method; and the positions of the magnets at other hours are deduced from a comparison of these with the luminous tracings. A few of the leading results are deduced numerically from the tracings, and set down in the observation books for printing. But as the precise value of the scale of the tracing is determined each day by a comparison with direct observation, the reading off of each day's tracing requires its own proportional scale to be applied. This is done in a way as simple as it is ingenious. A slip of vulcanised india rubber stretched in a frame, and admitting of extension by turning a screw, has a scale of divisions drawn upon it, which scale may be shortened or lengthened, by means of the screw, until it is adjusted to the scale of the tracing for any particular day, any part of which may thus be read off in correct units, by merely applying the elastic scale to it.

The light hitherto used for photographing is that of the camphine lamp, but it is expected that a substitute less liable to the annoyance of smoke and occasional derangement will be discovered. The magnets, lamps, and registering cylinders are shut up from the daylight in zinc cases. When an examination of the apparatus is to take place, the window shutters being closed, the superintendent takes a common lamp or candle, protected with a *yellow* glass, which sheds plenty of light, but light containing so few chemical rays as not to affect the sensitive paper whilst his examination is proceeding. We may add that the thermometer and barometer are both photographically registered; the former very simply and effectually, the latter (as might be expected) with less success at present.

The duties of the magnetic and meteorological department,

which lately required the undivided attention of four persons, will for the future be performed by two.\*

We have thus hastily gone over the chief parts of the Observatory, omitting, however, many minor details; and we must now attempt, in conclusion of this long article, to explain the excellently methodical way in which the onerous duties of this great national establishment are performed by the persons attached to it.

The PERSONAL ESTABLISHMENT has for some years consisted of the Astronomer Royal, G. B. Airy, Esq.; the Chief Assistant, The Rev. R. Main; five Astronomical Assistants; the principal Assistant in the Magnetic Department, Mr. Glaisher, with three other Assistants under him; besides occasional Computers employed from time to time, in number from two or three to as many as fifteen.

And first we have the Astronomer Royal himself, the nature of whose office has been already generally explained. The precise outline of his duties (never very clearly prescribed) has undergone in practice considerable modifications. Whilst the whole business of the Observatory was left to be performed by the astronomer and one assistant only (as was generally the case previous to the appointment of Mr. Pond), the astronomer undertook equally the labours of observation and calculation; but now that the establishment includes eight or nine subordinates, besides occasional computers, it will be easily understood that the adequate direction of so considerable an amount of manual power (for the duties of the subordinates are almost strictly mechanical) affords full employment for the intelligent head who has to direct all, and who is responsible for the labours of all. And indeed, when we consider the great number of instruments of different kinds in almost hourly use, the number of errors to which each instrument is especially liable, and the vigilance requisite to detect them; the fatigue of the immense calculations connected with the proceeds of almost every observation, and the pertinacity with which errors *will* intrude themselves into every kind of calculation, *especially the simplest*, — when we reflect besides that the progress of science is quite as rapid in practical astronomy as in almost any other department, and that the national astronomer is responsible for the character of his observatory, his instruments, and his results,

---

\* The weekly meteorological averages are regularly communicated by the Astronomer Royal to the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, &c., and are published by him in his Reports.



and is ever on the watch for introducing improvements from abroad or those which his own experience may suggest,—that he has, besides many duties of a nearly mechanical and official, but of an important, kind, imposed upon him by his connexion with the Admiralty,—and farther, that he is frequently called upon by Government for advice on scientific points, requiring much deliberate consideration, or even extensive experiments and the drawing up of elaborate reports; and that all astronomers in England or in the colonies look to Greenwich as a centre of astronomical information and experience, whence help may be looked for and advice obtained;—it must be apparent that an active and energetic Astronomer Royal, like the gentleman who at present, fortunately for science, fills the office, finds his time more than occupied, without himself making any of the current observations.

The hours of *regular* observatory work are from nine to two o'clock daily, except on Sundays; and for the greater part of this time the Astronomer Royal is to be found among the assistants of the astronomical department, in the computing room; where he oversees generally the work of the Observatory, regulates what observations are to be made, receives reports of those made during the preceding twenty-four hours, and generally is open to reference on every subject connected with the instruments, the calculations, or the personal establishment. It is a rule enforced by Mr. Airy, that all communications not of the simplest kind between him and his assistants, are conducted in writing; and thus the daily details of the Observatory, to the minutest particular, are preserved for future reference. The whole of the astronomer's extensive official correspondence is likewise methodised and preserved. The labour which this entails is rendered comparatively easy by methodical habits acquired through long practice; and a remarkable example of its utility has been shown in the recent publication of the entire correspondence relative to the discovery of Neptune and the perturbations of Uranus, published in the 'Proceedings' and also in the 'Memoirs of the Royal Astronomical Society.' The correspondence includes the smallest scraps of letters which passed on this interesting subject; their ultimate importance in the history of this the greatest discovery of modern astronomy, could not at the moment have been even guessed at. Those who have read that truly interesting chapter of scientific history will admit, that whilst few persons of the most rigorous business habits could have produced from their archives a correspondence extending over so many years, and so elaborately complete, it would be still more difficult to instance a case displaying more

perfect impartiality and frankness than were shown by Mr. Airy on this occasion, under circumstances of singular delicacy.

The Astronomer Royal is more especially responsible for the results of his observations as given to the world. The labour of keeping up the computations to the level of the observations, and of following up both by the irksome correction of the press must perpetually occupy his most serious attention. From time to time elaborate reports of the state of the calculations are made to him in writing; and, generally speaking, every printed sheet is revised by him before going to press. Having thus distinctly and day by day before him the whole operations of the Observatory, any irregularity is certain to strike his eye at once and be immediately corrected.

It may be proper to state that the Astronomer Royal receives his appointment by direct warrant from the Crown; and that on the demise of the sovereign a new warrant is requisite for the re-appointment. He is termed 'Our Astronomical Observer,' as in the time of Flamsteed. Although responsible to the Board of Admiralty for the charge and delivery of chronometers for the navy, and although he receives from them instructions regarding purely official matters, the astronomer does not consider himself under the direct control of that department. There is, however, one body connected with the Observatory whose functions are too peculiar to be passed over without notice, namely, the BOARD OF VISITORS.

The original appointment (Dec. 14. 1710), by warrant of Queen Anne, of the President, Vice-presidents, and certain Fellows of the Royal Society, selected by the Council to act as visitors of the Observatory, has already been referred to (page 319.). Although the unseemly disputes between Flamsteed and the members of this commission were little creditable to the parties, and although the interference of the visitors was not altogether effectual for the purposes contemplated in the warrant, it must be owned that the appointment of a scientific board of control and inspection, intermediate between the executive government and the Astronomer Royal, was almost essential, and has been attended with the happiest effects; and, so far as we are aware, not a single serious misunderstanding has occurred between the parties since Flamsteed's death. Whilst, on the other hand, the evil consequences of the want of some such power of inspection have been witnessed in other observatories both at home, and abroad, where astronomers, after having obtained a lucrative appointment, instead of devoting themselves to their observatories, have wasted or misapplied the time for the employment of which in the scientific service of the public they were in the avowed receipt of public money.

The visitors' warrant has been from time to time renewed without very material alteration\*, except that in the more recent (a copy of the latest is in our hands) the Admiralty is substituted for the Board of Ordnance, as the body to whom the visitors' report is to be made,—and the Astronomical Society is united with the Royal Society in having representatives at the Board of Visitors. On the whole, there is rather a greater jealousy shown in these warrants than in preceding ones, of the authority which was originally solely confided to the scientific visitors; and there appears a tendency to throw more power into the hands of the Admiralty, which has not, however, we believe been, in general, vexatiously exercised. The annual visitation is held at Greenwich on the first Saturday of June, when usually a considerable concourse of persons interested in science meet at the Observatory, and afterwards dine together at the *Crown and Sceptre*. There is no question but that the recurrence of this annual reunion tends considerably to inspirit the astronomer in the performance of his retired and sedentary labours. Occasionally, but not often, visitations are held at other periods. It is agreeable to perceive that, owing to the general attention and zeal of successive astronomers, the Board of Visitors have most commonly had the pleasing duty of limiting their reports to recommendations to the Government on the mode by which the suggestions of the astronomer for the advancement of his science may be best carried into effect. Such recommendations have been unusually frequent since Mr. Airy has presided over the Observatory; for no previous Astronomer Royal has taken such unceasing pains to improve to the utmost the facilities afforded him by his position for perfecting both astronomical and other observations.

Were we to single out any specialty by which Mr. Airy's conduct of the Observatory is distinguished from his predecessors, it is in the complete *reduction* of his observations. By *reduction* is technically meant the correction of the bare results recorded by the observer, for all instrumental and other appreciable sources of error, and the comparison of these results with the best existing astronomical theories, so as to afford the basis for still farther improving them. Thus every observation of the sun, moon, or planets, is made to represent the right ascension and declination of the body at a given instant; and the 'tabular

---

\* See copies of some of these warrants and regulations in Weld's 'History of the Royal Society,' vol. i. p. 400., vol. ii. p. 27, &c., 250. 293. See also 'Baily's Flamsteed,' pp. 91. 307., and 'Rigaud's Bradley,' p. lxxii.

'place,' or right ascension and declination, computed from the best existing tables, being also calculated (usually by interpolation from the 'Nautical Almanack'), the difference is set down as the error of the Tables at that instant. Thus, likewise, the results of every eclipse or occultation observed are so represented as to give conditional equations for the correction of the elements of the solar or lunar orbits. In like manner, the observations of the stars are combined, and cleared of the effects of precession, aberration, &c.; and the improved star catalogues which are thence deduced, are from time to time inserted in the 'Greenwich Observations.' It will be seen that all this involves an immense and ever-growing labour, which never was contemplated on the compiling of the earlier volumes of that work.\*

The admirable system of reductions commenced by Mr. Airy whilst Director of the Cambridge Observatory, was transferred by him to Greenwich. He appears to have been resolved to render the proceedings of our National Observatory not only the best and completest in the world, but the most accessible to men of science in their results. Accordingly, he voluntarily undertook the superintendence of the reduction of all the lunar and planetary observations of his predecessors since those of Bradley, — commencing with 1750, when, as we have observed in another part of this article, astronomy first became accurate, according to modern notions. This gigantic task, involving the minute discussion and reduction of at least fifteen thousand rough observations, made with a variety of different instruments of various degrees of perfection and adjustment, and extending over eighty years, is the greatest work of the kind that was ever attempted, and the most useful to astronomy. Every observation was compared with the corresponding tabular place, occasioning an equal number (15,000) of laborious computations, — those of the moon especially.† The mere results, printed in the most abridged form, filled three ponderous quartos, extending to 2200 pages:

---

\* It is not to be inferred, however, that such reductions were never made, although not systematically published. Mr. Airy has borne testimony to the industry and accuracy of his predecessors, Maskelyne and Pond, in conducting several important reductions, and especially comparisons of the moon's place with the tables, as proved from MSS. existing at the Royal Observatory. See 'Report to 'Visitors,' 1839, p. 3.

† The computation of a single tabular place of the moon, of which the steps are shown in the twelfth 'Skeleton Form' of Airy's 'Lunar Reductions,' vol. i., is itself an undertaking formidable by its extent and repulsive by its intricacy. This had to be 8393 times repeated in duplicate.

the expense of this immense undertaking was defrayed by Government, upon an application made by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1833. The calculations occupied in their gradual progress at least a dozen years; proceeding latterly with the utmost celerity, as many as sixteen computers being constantly employed in the great room at Greenwich, under the immediate superintendence of Mr. Hugh Breen, who just lived to see the work completed. The summary of these computations, as regards the correction of the lunar elements, is contained in a short paper lately communicated by Mr. Airy to the Astronomical Society (vol. xvii.). It embodies in a few lines the chief results of the system of Greenwich Observatory for nearly a century!

‘The process for the correction of the Elements,’ Mr. Airy wrote in 1846, ‘is now going on: and the extent of the work, even after so much has been prepared, almost exceeds belief. For the longitude, ten columns are added in groups, formed in thirteen different ways, each different way having on the average about 900 groups. For the ecliptic polar distance five columns are added in groups, formed in seven different ways, each different way having on the average about 900 groups. Thus it will appear that there are not fewer than 150,000 additions of columns of figures.’ (Report to Visitors, 1846, p. 9.)

This prodigious work can however have but few readers. Few, indeed, are even competent to apprehend the greatness of the service it has rendered to science. No laudatory notice of it has appeared, so far as we know, in even one of our literary journals; and if testimony has been borne to its utility in one foreign periodical exclusively devoted to astronomy, the Author’s main reward for so great and so gratuitous an expenditure of valuable time and anxious toil must be, that it will be a consciousness of the vastness of the boon conferred by it upon all practical and theoretical astronomers in all time coming; whilst it is also the noblest monument which human hands could rear to the venerated memories of Bradley, Maskelyne, and Pond.

Mr. Airy’s Annual Reports to the Board of Visitors (printed in the ‘Greenwich Observations’) present a lively picture of the activity of the Observatory since 1836, and should be read by any person desiring to make himself acquainted with the details of its management. But we refer to them now as showing that the reduction of the old observations has been only one of the many important labours in which the Astronomer Royal has engaged solely from scientific zeal, and in addition to his regular official duties. Among these we find a full investigation of the method of correcting ships’ compasses in iron-built ships,

the organisation and reduction of a great series of observations on the tides, particularly in Ireland, besides an elaborate treatise on the theory of tides and waves in the 'Encyclopædia Metro-politana.' As a member of the commission for restoring the lost national standards of weight and measure, it fell to Mr. Airy's lot to draw up the report embodying the conclusions from a vast mass of evidence. He was likewise a member of the Railway Gauge Commission, and at one time much of his attention was drawn away to that purely mechanical inquiry. When astronomical instruments are to be contrived or adapted for any public service, he is naturally the person to be referred to, and his instructions are frequently required by the parties who are to use them. We must quote one instance of the nature of the services in which his energies have occasion to be directed. It is given in his Report to the Observatory Visitors for 1844.

'In my last report I stated that the officers of the corps of Royal Engineers, who were to trace the Canadian Boundary, had been placed here for instruction and practice in the use of instruments under my eye. The most difficult part of the Boundary was a straight line of nearly seventy miles in length, to join two defined points. The country through which this line was to pass is described as surpassing in its difficulties the conception of any European. It consists of impervious forests, steep ravines, and dismal swamps. A survey of the line was impossible; and a tentative process would have broken the spirit of the best men. I therefore arranged a plan of operations founded on a determination of the absolute latitudes and the difference of longitudes of the two extremities. The difference of longitudes was determined by the transfer of chronometers, by the very circuitous route from one extremity to the other; and it was necessary to divide the whole arc into four parts, and to add a small part by measure and bearing. When this was finished, the azimuths of the line for the two ends were computed, and marks were laid off for starting with the line from both ends. One party, after cutting more than *forty-two miles* through the woods, were agreeably surprised, on the brow of a hill, to see directly before them a gap in the woods on the next line of hill: it opened gradually, and proved to be the line of the opposite party. On continuing the lines until they passed abreast of each other, their distance was found to be 341 feet. To form an estimate of the magnitude of this error, it is to be observed, that it implies an error of only a quarter of a second of time in the difference of longitudes; and that it is only one third of the error which would have been committed if the spheroidal form of the earth had been neglected. . . . Transits were observed and chronometers were interchanged when the temperature was lower than 19° below zero; and when the native assistants, though paid highly, deserted on account of the severity of the weather, the British officers still continued the observations, upon whose delicacy every thing depended.'

But besides these contributions to the scientific department of the public service, Mr. Airy has during his residence at Greenwich continued to communicate to the Transactions of the Royal Society of London, the Astronomical Society, and the Cambridge Philosophical Society, a multitude of papers on mechanical, optical, and astronomical subjects (including both physical and practical astronomy), which might alone have appeared to give full employment for a man otherwise at leisure. But it is not our business to enter into these details, nor to discuss the philosophical merits of the Astronomer Royal, otherwise than in his strictly official capacity.

There is a good residence attached to the Observatory, and (as we have already remarked) it would be difficult to find a spot which seems to speak more of complete repose and abstraction from the busy world (whose hum, however, is only just beyond earshot) than this forest lodge of Flamsteed House. Shall we wonder, then, if its tenant is still invested, now and then, by popular credulity, with a character uniting the *astrologer* with the astronomer? And yet shall we venture on lowering his reputation in any quarter by admitting our misgivings that, among the manifold talents and acquirements of this excellent astronomer, he may not be able to cast a nativity, or foretell what conjunction of the planets would be favourable to the British Arms? The Boards of Admiralty and Ordnance might in another age have thought that 'Our Astronomical Observer' would have been quite as well employed in thus seeking to read the heavens as in rating chronometers, or in drawing boundary lines. It is, at all events, a curious link between the present and the past, that Flamsteed on his accession to Greenwich amused himself by drawing the horoscope of the Observatory, — an accomplishment, perhaps, within the experience of few existing astronomers. Although the link is pretty well broken, there still are persons who believe that our Astronomer Royal is not always contemplating the starry sphere in vain: And, if we are not misinformed, no long time has passed since a well-dressed female called at the Observatory Gate to request a hint as to the means of recovering a lost sum of money, — and since somebody at Brighton despatched the liberal sum of *five shillings* in a Post-Office order, with a request to have his nativity cast for him in return!\*

---

\* The following epistolary specimen of the 'march of intellect,' of the year 1849, has been handed to us from the Royal Observatory. — 'I have been informed that there are persons at this Observatory who will, by my enclosing a remittance and the time of my birth, give me to understand *who is to be my wife*. An early answer, stating all relative particulars, will greatly oblige,' &c.

But if the Magic of astronomy has all but vanished in the 19th century, we also fear that the greater part of its Poetry has evaporated. If a young man has any lingering romance about astronomy, such as we spoke of in the commencement of this article, let him try the post of an ordinary assistant at Greenwich for six months, and we believe that he will be 'planet-struck' no more. The regular astronomical assistants are five in number, besides Mr. Main, who is in a position of general superintendence, and immediately represents the Astronomer Royal on occasions of unavoidable absence. The work of looking through telescopes is a small part indeed of an assistant's ordinary routine: for five hours daily he is seated at his desk in the computing room, copying figures, taking out logarithms, adding and subtracting; in short, performing the most tedious repetition of the simpler rules of arithmetic, with an apparently endless iteration; and tied down all the while to the impossibility of a mistake as to what to do next, by the Procrustean bed of a '*skeleton form.*' Lest these words should appear ominous of any peculiar barbarity practised in the Greenwich computing room, we will explain their meaning in a single sentence.

It is the very essence of a system of observation that the same thing is to be repeated over and over in the very same manner, perhaps every day or several times a day: thus the taking of every transit consists of the self-same steps; and the corrections requisite for placing of the wires, the error of level and collimation, and the error of the clock, though not always *numerically* the same, enter, however, in every case, into the same part of the correction of the results. Therefore a '*skeleton form*' for entering and correcting a transit observation may be *printed*, in which every step of the observation or calculation shall be pointed out, and a space left for inscribing the right figures belonging to each particular observation; while in the margin there may be directions to add or subtract, to take a logarithm, or to look in a certain table for a certain correction to be applied in a certain way: thus the operator, following the steps provided for him, can no more go astray than the visitor to the Monument can quit the narrow stair which conducts him from the base to the gallery on the top. However, no pleasant view nor grateful repose awaits the computer, who has toiled to the top, or rather the bottom, of *his* column. His labour is Sisyphean; he begins just where he left off, without feeling himself either the wiser or better for what he has done. Still, like the mason of the material building within which he is engaged, he has added one brick to the edifice of human



knowledge; and grow it will, though unperceived almost by himself. Nor should we omit to add, that the mechanical effort of computation, as it requires habit and dexterity to perform it speedily and correctly, so it strangely enough yet certainly does carry with it a species of quiet pleasure almost peculiar to itself, and which none but those who have voluntarily undertaken long and monotonous calculations are likely to understand. We confess to have passed many hours and days of no mean enjoyment in this mechanical kind of occupation; and few persons acquainted with the practice of accurate science but can bear testimony to the soothing calm which may be induced by the simple act of calculation.\*

The Greenwich Observatory assistant is not, however, a calculator merely; nor do his duties usually end with the hours just specified. Several days a week, at least, he is in charge of an instrument, and his duty is, whilst employed in the computing room, to keep his eye on a timepiece indicating *sidereal* time, and having regard also to a list furnished to him of objects which he is required to observe (supposing them sufficiently conspicuous to be visible by daylight through the telescope). Five minutes before the sidereal hour corresponding to the right ascension of the object, he withdraws silently to the transit or circle room, with his metallic pencil and pocket-book in hand, in which he enters the observations; next copies it, with ink, into the 'transit book,' or the 'circle book,' as the case may be, and then quietly resumes his interrupted calculation. Of course, however, more objects fall to be observed during the night than during the day; and to

---

\* Of mechanical aids to calculation, the following are the most important:—1. *Logarithms*, by which multiplications and divisions are reduced to additions and subtractions. 2. *Subsidiary Tables*, giving the compendious results of certain calculations which have to be frequently repeated, and which, therefore, may be done commodiously once for all. 3. The *Sliding Rule*, by which the result of multiplications and divisions are found (approximately) by mere inspection. This is used at Greenwich for many simple calculations, such as the proportional parts of clock rates for different hours. 4. Enlarged *Multiplication Table*. Crelle's useful work (2 vols. 8vo.) gives the products of all numbers under 1000 by simple inspection. 5. *Wertheimer's instrument for adding* mechanically. The head-work of adding long columns is spared; the machine *carries*, and indicates the final result. This is very useful in taking meteorological means. But caution is required to see that the machine acts correctly. 6. *Skeleton Forms*, above explained. Above 100 of these have been printed for current use at Greenwich, and are numbered consecutively. This is independent of a large number used for the old planetary and lunar reductions.

regulate the night work of the assistants so as not to render it too oppressive, is one of the Astronomer Royal's indispensable, but very troublesome concerns—to exact what is right and necessary, but not to harass his subordinates with exhausting work of inconsiderable value. Each assistant set down for observing duty on a given day has, as a general rule, to watch for the objects marked as essential to be observed from 3 A. M. (or 15h. in the astronomer's language) to 3 A. M. of the following day. But he is not to sit up the whole night that he may note the place of all the stars which may be on his observing list, unless for some special reason. But he is expected (suppose him to be at the transit) to observe a sufficient number of 'clock-stars' to ascertain the clock-error for that day; and to take as many observations as he can whilst waiting for the moon or a planet, or *Polaris*, (used for the verification of the adjustment of the transit instrument). The altitude and azimuth instrument, destined specially for lunar observations off the meridian, is to be used at whatever hour the moon can be seen (by reason of clouds, &c.) between sunset and moonset, or before sunrise and after moonrise. The object being to obtain the moon's place in the parts of her orbit nearest to the sun, a good many morning watches are required every month. Mr. Airy states that this laborious duty is performed by the assistants with great fidelity and zeal.

The assistants have two rooms appropriated to their use (besides Mr. Main's room) during the intervals of night observations, but none of them reside on the premises. Fortunately for them, a track of bad weather sometimes gives a welcome holiday; whilst a course of uninterrupted sunshine (which, thanks to our climate, seldom happens) menaces the establishment with fever and apoplexy. The dogdays are the astronomers' harvest time; for (notwithstanding the apparently splendid starlight nights of winter) winter is the real holiday at Greenwich, as an inspection of the printed observations will show. The prevalence of cloudy weather is greatest in the winter and least in the summer quarter. Such is the return given by the 'Greenwich Observations' for 1846, although the proportion of covered sky is not so different at different seasons, as an inspection of the printed observations (which show a great preponderance of work done in summer) would lead us to expect. On an average of the whole year 1846, during day and night, *seven tenths* of the sky are always cloudy! The night on the whole is clearer than the day. The forenoon hours are the most cloudy, the evening least so. It is wonderful on the whole, considering the proverbial badness of our sky, how few days occur alto-

gether blank in the astronomer's year; for proof of which we again refer to the printed 'Observations.'

There is one remarkable peculiarity which has been found to be connected with the act of observation in astronomy when time is to be ascertained: it is what is called the *personal equation* of the observer. This phrase expresses the curious but well established fact that some persons, equally careful and experienced with others, *invariably* perceive a phenomenon (such as the passage of a star across the wires of the transit instrument) somewhat later in point of time; so that, in the determination of clock rates (the most fundamental of all astronomical determinations), such an observer would make the clock appear to be *too fast* in every instance. In a mutual comparison of personal equations, among twelve persons employed at Greenwich in 1846 ('Greenwich Observations,' p. xxvii. &c.), it was found that there was an extreme average difference of *three quarters of a second* between two of these,—a quantity by no means to be safely neglected; consequently, all observations are reduced to the standard of sight of one individual arbitrarily selected. In the recent reduction of the older Greenwich observations this correction was not overlooked; and for this reason (as well as others which are obvious) every observation is entered and printed with the initials of the person making it. From observations with the altitude and azimuth instrument it is believed that, in some peculiar instances, the transit of the *limb* of a body, with a disc like the moon or a planet, is observed differently (as respects the personal equation) from that of a star.\*

The same assistant is never put upon heavy observing work two nights running; nor is he expected to appear in the computing room early in the morning if he has been observing during the night. On the whole, however, the observations are lighter work than the calculations; and the former are always running a-head of the latter. It requires the utmost vigilance on the part of the director to see that the calculations are duly kept up; and for this purpose he has an occasional report made to him (which has been already referred to) of the exact state of every department of calculation or reduction. This document—which is itself a curiosity—gives a better idea of the extent of the labours of computation required to make observations useful to science than any thing else could do. It extends to seven printed pages, in small folio, for astronomical calculations, and six pages for magnetism and meteorology; and these pages contain the mere heads or entries of the data and reduc-

---

\* See Mr. Airy's 'Report to Visitors,' 1849, p. 10.

tions. From these, and from the daily reports of what has been actually observed, the director of the Observatory knows exactly what is doing in each department. Whenever, owing to a course of fine weather, to the appearance of a batch of comets, or any other event which produces over-work in the establishment, the reductions fall considerably behind, the astronomer lays on more computing power, by employing certain occasional assistants, for whose pay he is very judiciously authorised by Government to expend a certain sum annually. This supplementary body has contributed very materially to the efficiency of the Observatory, and has enabled it to secure many most important objects at a very small additional expense. It is easy to see that when so expensive and elaborate an institution as a National Observatory is in full and active operation, an exceedingly small addition of manual power will immensely increase the useful work which it can accomplish.

As a general rule, Sunday is a holiday: only the moon's place is observed and the time-ball dropped, — operations requiring but one assistant, and for a short time. A great improvement this on the looser practice of former times, when observations of all kinds were made on Sundays.

Besides Sunday, the establishment has a monthly holiday (as far as calculation is concerned). This is judiciously selected at or near new moon, when our troublesome satellite cannot be observed. Each assistant has also from four to five weeks of leave during the year, at such time or times as can be arranged most conveniently for himself. The Astronomer Royal takes a like holiday; and no person in the Queen's dominions deserves it better. Although an old rule of the Visitors provided that he should never be more than ten days absent without leave, at no time was this probably more than a form. The Astronomer Royal and the chief assistant, however, are never absent at once.

The arrangements of the Magnetical Observatory may be inferred, generally, from what has been now stated concerning the Astronomical department. The observations being perfectly regular and unintermitted day or night, independently of the state of the weather, would seem to be more harassing in that particular; and the observers were originally required to give proof of their actual attendance at the specified hours by pushing in the pin of a *tell-tale*, or *watchman's clock*, — an instrument so contrived as to register the time at which the thrust has been made, and thus insure the presence and wakefulness of the party on duty: but this irksome system of control is now happily superseded by Mr. Brooke's invention of the photographic regis-

tration of the magnets. With regard to calculations and reductions, those of the magnetic and meteorological department are, on the whole, vastly inferior in point of labour and extent to the astronomical ones.\* The calculations of averages are, however, very laborious.

The printing department is not the least oppressive to the Observatory corps. The observations being printed in a form different from that in which they are necessarily entered into the 'skeleton forms' for the purpose of reduction, they must be copied for the press. But to avoid the effects of clerical errors, the first proof sheets are read along with the entries in the computing books. Even the unrivalled excellence of London printers cannot supersede the labours of the Observatory assistants. When so many mistakes may occur,—not only from putting one figure for another, but also from error of *sign*, + or —, (although this, the most fertile, because the simplest, source of all blunders, has been reduced to a minimum through the exclusion of signs, by Mr. Airy, in every practicable case, corrections being, as a general rule, made positive) as well as from misplacing figures in columns imperfectly filled,—the utmost vigilance is required, and is never at last *perfectly* successful. The *reading* of a sheet of eight quarto pages employs the time of two assistants for two mornings. It will be seen at once how much labour is consumed in the course of the year in this merely mechanical process. The number of copies printed of the ordinary observations is 350, and the expense is regulated and defrayed by the Stationery Office: it was formerly in the department of the Ordnance.

We have now attempted to give a tolerably complete idea of the manner of working our *one* national and purely scientific establishment,—what is the nature of its occupations, and what has been its measure of success. It is of peremptory necessity, in so populous a vicinity, that the admission to the Observatory itself of the general public should be absolutely interdicted. A suspension of all business and the injury of the instruments would be the inevitable consequence of a different rule; and it appears, from the records of the Observatory and of the Board of Visitors, that these evils have actually occurred. At present, therefore, no one not officially connected with the public service, and not himself a man of recognised scientific

---

\* We must except, however, the determination of *absolute* horizontal intensities; but this most interesting experiment is not often made, and the results appear to be still affected by unestimated sources of error.

character, can be admitted into the Observatory, and these only by a suitable introduction to the Astronomer Royal. Curiosity is naturally enhanced when its gratification is difficult: and it is for this reason that we have tried to give some idea of Greenwich Observatory to those who may not have an opportunity of visiting it themselves; and to render a visit more instructive to those who may be so privileged.

We have said that the instrumental department is now, even at the time we write, undergoing a great, in some measure even a radical, change. Mr. Airy is trying the great experiment of using a more powerful telescope than has yet been applied to divided circular instruments of the highest accuracy; and he is likewise combining the transit and meridian circle into one instrument.\* The result of the combination is a telescope eight inches aperture and twelve feet long, which will be connected with a vertical circle six feet in diameter, the whole being framed in cast iron and mounted upon two independent piers furnished with Y's by means of a transverse axis of great strength. It is not intended, however, to be reversed like a transit instrument, but the line of collimation will be adjusted by means of two fixed telescopes. It will be the joint work of Messrs. Ransome and May of Ipswich, and of Mr. Simms of London. We have already stated that a new zenith tube on an original construction is in progress. It is not hoped that results will be obtained with the transit circle very much superior to those obtained from the excellent instruments hitherto in use; but the state of science generally, and particularly the multitude of small planets recently discovered, call for the application of a higher power, and of telescopes with a greater command of light than those which have heretofore been used. The employment of an enlarged telescope requires the remodelling of every part of the apparatus, so as to support the increased weight.

In drawing this lengthened article to a conclusion, we are bound to make explicit acknowledgments to the Astronomer Royal for the aid he has given us in obtaining the minutest information connected with every part of the Observatory and its management: without which information, it is needless to say, that our intended object could not have been fulfilled†:

---

\* The plan of a reversible transit circle is due to Römer, who set one up in 1690. After having been abandoned for more than a century, it is now adopted in the finest modern observatories.

† Our thanks are also due to Mr. Main, the assistant-in-chief; and to Mr. Glaisher, the principal assistant in the Magnetic Department, for valuable information politely communicated by them.

And while we express our admiration of the singular combination of qualities which he possesses for the management of a National Observatory, we cannot but add our sincere hope, both for his own sake and for the public benefit, that his life and vigour may be long preserved.

*Postscript.* Since this article was written and put in type, we have had the pleasure of seeing a volume of 'Popular Lectures on Astronomy,' by Mr. Airy, printed from short-hand notes taken at Ipswich, where the lectures were delivered, in 1848, to a numerous audience of a mixed character. They contain a very clear and popular exposition of the more practical parts of astronomy, couched in plain, precise, and highly graphic language. They are published in a neat form with clear illustrative plates, for behoof of the Ipswich Museum. Had they been sooner in our hands, we should not have failed to refer frequently to them in the course of these pages. But we are happy to be able to recommend to our readers a work which contains, in so elementary a shape, so large an amount of valuable and accurate information.

ART. II.—*Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the Years 1804, 1805, and 1806.*  
By the late Rev. SYDNEY SMITH, M.A. London, 1849.  
Pp. 424.

THIS volume—printed, but, at the time we are writing, not yet published—appeals not to our tribunal; one hundred copies only have been issued to gratify the eye of private friendship. Under such circumstances, we feel little disposition to make it the subject of detailed criticism; nor would our disinclination for the task be removed, even were the merit of the volume much less or its faults much greater than they will either of them be found to be. For the deficiencies in a posthumous work, the publication of which was neither contemplated nor desired by him, the author cannot properly be held responsible. It is its merits alone, which are indeed his own. But in the present case those merits may be more gracefully made the subject of minute criticism anywhere than in this Journal, the pages of which have been so often illuminated by his wit and genius. Of that wit and genius it is not now necessary, here or elsewhere, to enter into a critical estimate. Sydney Smith has had his due place of honour long assigned him. We shall better occupy the little space allotted to us by presenting our readers with a

few brief specimens of that vigorous intellect—a few scintillations of that brilliant wit—which in past times have so often delighted them.

But alas! there are other reasons for inexpressible reluctance to assume the critic's office in the case before us. The duty has been virtually performed by one—and it was the last office of the kind he ever did perform—than whom none could perform it more justly or more kindly;—by one of whom we do not venture to say more at present. We refer to that illustrious friend of Sydney Smith who, in conjunction with him and other men of genius, projected the present Journal, and who presided for so long a series of years over the tribunal of criticism he had established, with a taste, skill, and energy, on which the public has already long since pronounced its judgment. He has now passed from among us; but his name and memory are embalmed in the veneration and affection of all who knew him.

Lord Jeffrey had received the present volume and was engaged in perusing it, only a few days before his death. The delight it gave him, and the spirit in which he seized the opportunity it afforded him of expressing his sense of the merits he had overlooked at first, are so strikingly characteristic of his candour and generosity of nature, that we must not suppress a brief account of what passed on the occasion.

The notes of these lectures, delivered nearly half a century ago—about the period, in fact, when the two friends first commenced their long literary career,—were never prepared or designed for publication. Their author had even often resolved on their destruction; and on one occasion partly accomplished his purpose. His family naturally begged a reprieve, and wisely as well as naturally; for, as old Fuller says of Herbert's remains, even 'shavings of gold are carefully to be kept.' At his death, the interest of the family in them was renewed. Anxious to ascertain the propriety or otherwise of giving these lectures to the public, and knowing how well they could rely on Lord Jeffrey's judgment and kindness, Mrs. Smith sent the manuscript to him for his opinion. He,—doubtless feeling much more strongly than the generality of men, how much injustice is often done to genius by publishing what itself would be mortified to think should see the light without the advantage of careful revision, and perceiving also, on a slight and partial inspection, that some parts of the present work would require that revision to do them full justice,—advised that the volume should not be published. Out of acquiescence, we may presume, in this sentence, a few copies only were struck off in the first instance for private circulation.



And now comes the incident which it is such a pleasure to record. On perusing the volume in print, Lord Jeffrey at once discerned, in spite of *hiatus*, mutilations, and imperfections, so many indications of the 'vis viva' of genius—so many traces of originality, splendour, and power—that he lost no time in writing to Mrs. Smith a beautiful letter, retracting his former cautious judgment in the amplest manner. 'I cannot rest,' said he, 'till I have not merely expressed my thanks to you for the gratification I have received, but made some amends for the rash, and I fear somewhat ungracious, judgment I passed upon it, after perusing a few passages of the manuscript some years ago. I have not recognised any of these passages in any part of the print I am reading, and think I must have been unfortunate in the selection, or chance, by which I was directed to them. . . . I am now satisfied I was quite wrong. My firm impression is, that, with few exceptions, they will do him as much credit as any thing he ever wrote; and produce, on the whole, a stronger impression of the force and vivacity of his intellect, as well as a truer and more engaging view of his character than what the world has yet seen in his writings. Some of the conclusions may be questionable, but I do think them generally just, and never propounded with anything like arrogance, or in any tone of assumption; and the whole subject treated with quite as much, either of subtlety or profundity, as was compatible with a popular exposition of it. I retract, therefore, peremptorily and firmly, the advice I formerly gave against the publication of these discourses.'

It was traits like these—of sweetness, frankness, and fearless love of truth; the rare magnanimity which made him ever ready to recant an error, when he had reason to suspect that he had been betrayed into one,—traits beautifully displayed in his introduction to his essays reprinted from this Journal,—which not only endeared him to so large a circle of friends, but rendered it impossible for him to have any permanent enemies. Such qualities had, in fact, long before his death, conciliated towards him the esteem and affection of most of those who, in earlier years, thought they had reason to complain of the severity of the criticisms which he had either himself passed, or had suffered others to pass, on their productions. Even literary animosities—the most embittered, perhaps, of any—could not but yield before the genial warmth of his frank and kind-hearted nature. These traits made him more truly great than the opulence of his knowledge—the elegance of his fancy—the acuteness of his logic—or the vigour and the versatility of his genius.

After such a testimony, we trust that the publication of these

'Elementary Sketches' may be confidently reckoned upon—perhaps before the appearance of our present number: in which case it is to be hoped that this beautiful and instructive letter will be prefixed to them.

Paradoxical as the statement may seem, we think there was sufficient reason for Lord Jeffrey to affirm both his earlier and his later judgment; reason, in the first instance, for his caution,—prompted doubtless by a genuine solicitude for his friend's reputation,—and reason for his subsequent retraction on seeing the whole in print. He perceived that the volume, after all deductions, was everywhere so pervaded with vigorous thought, and so adorned by felicitous illustration, as to render it not only not unworthy of Sydney Smith's genius, but an acceptable contribution to the literature of mental philosophy: Not to mention the numerous passages which, as often as the lecturer has occasion to apply his philosophy to the business and bosoms of men, do the greatest honour to the elevation of his sentiments and the humanity of his heart.

In truth, we are disposed to concur with Lord Jeffrey, in thinking, that however some *hiatus* may be 'lamented,' and certain modifications desiderated, this volume will raise Sydney Smith higher in the esteem of the public, as a thinker, than any of his previous writings. He has been by many principally regarded as a man of exquisite wit indeed, but of little more than wit; of infinite facetiousness, but with moderate powers of argument or speculation, at least in relation to abstract science. We are much mistaken if these pages do not vindicate his claim to rank with philosophers; whether he be not an illustration of his own theory, propounded in one of these lectures, and more than once propounded by other writers in this Journal,—that great wit rarely exists alone; that few men have ever possessed it in extraordinary measure, without being *capable* by nature of achieving something higher and better than its own triumphs; a theory supported by the fact that in one or other of its diversified modes, it has been an almost inseparable concomitant of the most splendid forms of genius—whether in the departments of philosophy, poetry, or eloquence.

There are few parts of these lectures over which it is possible to glance, especially when we bear in mind the abstruseness of the subject, and the youthfulness of the professor,—difficulties not likely to be lightened by the necessity of descanting on such themes before a popular and miscellaneous audience, without being struck with the indications of power which they everywhere present. Inexhaustible vivacity and variety of illustration one would, of course, expect from such a mind;

but this is far from being all. The sound judgment and discrimination with which he often treats very difficult topics,—the equilibrium of mind which he maintains when discussing those on which his own idiosyncrasy might be supposed to have led him astray—of which an instance is seen in his temperate estimate of the value of wit and humour,—the union of independence and modesty with which he canvasses the opinions of those from whom he differs,—the comprehensiveness of many of his speculations, and the ingenuity of others,—the masterly ease and perspicuity with which even abstruse thoughts are expressed, and the frequently original, and sometimes profound remarks on human nature to which he gives utterance—remarks hardly to be expected from *any* young metaphysician, and least of all from one of so lively and mercurial a temperament,—all render these lectures very profitable as well as very pleasant reading; and show conclusively that the author might, if he had pleased, have acquired no mean reputation as an expositor of the very arduous branch of science to which they relate. Doubtless there is many a 'bone' in these lectures which a keen metaphysician would be disposed to 'pick' with the author; for when was a metaphysical banquet spread without abundance of such meagre fare? Still the general merits of the volume every man of sense will assuredly admit to be very great.

But our readers will feel that our rapidly dwindling space had better be devoted to giving them some light prelibation of the contents of this interesting volume, than to further disquisition on either its merits or defects; and to this accordingly we proceed.

When Sydney Smith undertook to popularise to a London audience the subject of Mental Philosophy, he was just fresh from the schools of Edinburgh, where he had heard Dugald Stewart and Thomas Brown prelecting on their favourite science. It is impossible to conceive an assembly less adapted to the reception of such mysteries than a metropolitan audience of that period. It would have been almost as hopeful for a Stoic to lecture on Zeno's system in the Garden of Epicurus.

The title of the lectures will be apt to mislead many readers of the present day. The author uses the words 'Moral Philosophy' in the sense in which they were currently accepted in the schools in which he had been studying; as including, that is, not only, what they are so often now used to import, Ethics properly so called, but the whole of what is denominated at present 'Mental Philosophy.'

The Introductory Lecture is certainly not the least interesting

in the volume. The following remarks on the alleged uncertainty and vagueness of the science are very characteristic:—

‘The existence of mind is as much a matter of *fact* as the existence of matter; it is as true that men remember, as that oxygen united to carbon makes carbonic acid. I am as sure that anger and affection are principles of the human mind, as I am that grubs make cockchafers; or of any of those great truths which botanists teach of lettuces and cauliflowers. The same patient observation, and the same caution in inferring, are as necessary for the establishment of truth in this science as in any other; rash hypothesis misleads as much, modest diligence repays as well. Whatever has been done for this philosophy has been done by the inductive method only; and to that alone it must look for all the improvement of which it is capable. . . . .

A great deal of unpopularity has been incurred by this science from the extravagancies or absurdities of those who have been engaged in it. When the mass of mankind hear that all thought is explained by vibrations and vibratiuncles of the brain,—that there is no such thing as a material world,—that what mankind consider as their arms and legs are not arms and legs, but *ideas*, accompanied with the notion of *outness*; that we have not only no bodies, but no minds,—that we are nothing, in short, but currents of reflection and sensation;—all this, I admit, is well calculated to approximate in the public mind the ideas of lunacy and intellectual philosophy. But if it be fair to argue against a science from the bad method in which it is prosecuted, such a mode of reasoning ought to have influenced mankind centuries ago to have abandoned all the branches of physics as utterly hopeless. I have surely an equal right to rake up the mouldy errors of all the other sciences,—to reproach astronomy with its vortices,—chemistry with its philosopher’s stone,—history with its fables,—law with its cruelty and ignorance,—and if I were to open this battery against medicine, I do not know where I should stop. Zinzis Khan, when he was most crimsoned with blood, never slaughtered the human race as they have been slaughtered by rash and erroneous theories of medicine.

‘If there be a real foundation for this science, if observation can do *anything*, and has not done all, there is room for *hope*, and reason for exertion. The extravagancies by which it has been disgraced, ought to warn us of the difficulty, without leading us to despair. To say there is no path, because we have often got into the wrong path, puts an end to all other knowledge as well as to this.

‘The truth is, it fares worse with this science than with many others, because its errors and extravagancies are comprehended by so many. . . . Every man is not necessarily an astronomer, but every man has some acquaintance with the operations of his own mind; and you cannot deviate *grossly* from the truth on these subjects without incurring his ridicule and reprehension. This perhaps is one cause why errors of this nature have been somewhat unduly magnified.’

Nor less characteristic are the observations in confutation of the asserted tendency of the science to foster scepticism :—

'Scepticism, which is commonly laid to the charge of this philosophy, may, in the first place, be fairly said to have done its worst. Bishop Berkeley destroyed this world in one volume octavo; and nothing remained after his time, but mind—which experienced a similar fate from the hand of Mr. Hume, in 1737; so that, with all the tendency to destroy, there remains nothing left for destruction: but I would fain ask if there be any one human being, from the days of Protagoras the Abderite to this present hour, who was ever for a single instant a convert to these subtle and ingenious follies? Is there any one out of Bedlam who *doubts* of the existence of matter? who doubts of his own personal identity? or of his consciousness, or of the general credibility of memory? Men *talk* on such subjects from ostentation, or because such wire-drawn speculations are an agreeable exercise to them; but they are perpetually recalled by the necessary business, and the inevitable feelings of life, to sound and sober opinions on these subjects. Errors, to be dangerous, must have a great deal of truth mingled with them; it is only from this alliance that they can ever obtain an extensive circulation; from pure extravagance, and genuine, unmingled falsehood, the world never has, and never can, sustain any mischief. It is not in our power to believe all that we please; our belief is modified and restrained by the nature of our faculties, and by the constitution of the objects by which we are surrounded. We may believe anything for a moment, but we shall soon be lashed out of our impertinence by hard and stubborn realities. A great philosopher may sit in his study, and deny the existence of matter; but if he goes to take a walk in the streets he must take care to leave his theory behind him. Pyrrho said there was no such thing as pain; and he saw no *proof* that there were such things as carts and waggons; and he refused to get out of their way: but Pyrrho had, fortunately for him, three or four stout slaves, who followed their master, without following his doctrine, and whenever they saw one of these ideal machines approaching, took him by the arms and legs, and, without attempting to controvert his arguments, put him down in a place of safety.' (P. 7.)

The following observations are in a higher mood :—

'But what are we to do? If the enemies of religion derive subtlety and acuteness from this pursuit, ought not their own weapons to be turned against them? And ought not some to study for defence if others do for the purposes of aggression? When the old anarch Hobbes came out to destroy the foundations of morals, who entered the lists against him? Not a man afraid of metaphysics, not a man who had become sceptical as he had become learned, but Ralph Cudworth, Doctor of Divinity; a man who had learned much from reading the errors of the human mind, and from deep meditation, its nature;—who made use of those errors to avoid them, and derived from that meditation principles too broad and too deep

to be shaken; such a man was gained to the cause of morality and religion by these sciences. These sciences certainly made no infidel of Bishop Warburton, as Chubb, Morgan, Tindal, and half a dozen others found to their cost. . . . Locke was no sceptic, nor was Lord Verulam. Malebranche and Arnauld were both of them exceedingly pious men. We none of us can believe that Dr. Paley has exercised his mind upon intellectual philosophy in vain. The fruits of it in him are sound sense, delivered so perspicuously, that a man may profit by it, and a child may comprehend it.

‘I have already quoted too many names, but I must not omit one which would alone have been sufficient to have shown that there is no necessary connexion between scepticism and the philosophy of the human mind: I mean Bishop Butler. To his sermons we are indebted for the complete overthrow of the selfish system, and to his “Analogy” for the most noble and surprising defence of revealed religion, perhaps, which has ever yet been made of any system whatever.’

In a yet finer style are the remarks on the proofs which the mind itself affords of a Divine Creator—a subject not yet fully worked out, by either Dr. Chalmers or by any of the several writers whom Dr. Turton has enumerated in his ‘Natural Theology;’ and which requires, to do it full justice, the deliberate labours of a mind—if ever there shall be such a prodigy—uniting the metaphysical depth of Butler with Paley’s felicity of representation:—

‘But there is no occasion to prop this argument up by great names. The school of natural religion is the contemplation of nature; the ancient anatomist, who was an Atheist, was converted by the study of the human body; he thought it impossible that so many admirable contrivances should exist, without an Intelligent Cause: and if men can become religious from looking at an entrail, or a nerve, can they be taught Atheism from analysing the structure of the human mind? Are not the affections and passions, which shake the very entrails of man, and the thoughts and feelings which dart along those nerves, more indicative of a God than the vile perishing instruments themselves? Can you remember the nourishment which springs up in the breast of a mother, and forget the feelings which spring up in her heart? If God made the blood of man, did he not make that feeling, which summons the blood to his face, and makes it the sign of guilt and of shame? You may show me a human hand, expatiate upon the singular contrivances of its sinews and bones—how admirable, how useful for all the purposes of grasp and flexure! I will show you, in return, the mind, receiving her tribute from the senses;—comparing, reflecting, compounding, dividing, abstracting;—the passions, soothing, aspiring, exciting, till the whole world falls under the dominion of man; evincing that in his mind the Creator has reared up the noblest emblem of his wisdom and his power. The philosophy of the human mind is no school for infidelity, but it

excites the warmest feelings of piety, and defends them with the soundest reason.' (P. 11.)

The observations on the *utility* of the science are distinguished by a most judicious moderation—moderation the more admirable when it is considered that it is almost an uniform tendency of the juvenile metaphysician to form exaggerated estimates of the *practical* value of his favourite pursuits; and that the distinguished man, at whose feet Sydney Smith had so reverently sat as pupil, had prophesied all sorts of splendid results from the more vigorous prosecution of the inductive science of Mind,—in relation particularly to education, legislation, and political economy. Such prospects, it need hardly be said, have not been realised; nor in our view are they likely to be. This branch of science, indeed, will be always worthy of the profound study of an intelligent nature; for what, in truth, can be worthy of it, if the very structure and mechanism of that very nature itself be not? These subjects are worthy of investigation quite apart from any presumed utility; just as there are many other things which we all study, and many study deeply, from the *direct* use of which not one in a million anticipates the actual making of two-pence. As to the immediately practical bearings of Mental Philosophy on Education, we apprehend, with Sydney Smith, that all its more important facts have been pretty patent to mankind for thousands of years. And it may be added, that the application even of these more obvious facts depends much more on practical tact, skill, and habit, than on any profound knowledge of their theory. The best schoolmasters, we suspect, have not been, nor are likely to be, the most refined mental analysts.

The *real* utility of the science consists in its being a peculiar *discipline*, a valuable system of intellectual gymnastics; in its immediate influence on our *habits* of thinking, investigation, and expression; and in the light it throws on the criticism of the greatest of the Fine Arts, more particularly on poetry and eloquence,—the philosophy of which is, in fact, a section of the science of mind. In these points of view, and especially in the two first, the utility of the science cannot be easily exaggerated; like language and the mathematics, it forms an essential part of that just and comprehensive training which must be employed in order to develope, in harmonious proportion, *all* the faculties of the human mind. These branches of education are all supplementary to one another; not one can be wisely dispensed with. Their capacity of *direct* application is in most cases secondary to their value as a discipline. But though not one person in a hundred may ever need to make use, in ordinary life, of the formulæ of Trigonometry, or the Calculus, or to

refer to Descartes' Theory of 'Innate Ideas,' or Berkeley's 'Theory of Vision,' it is sufficient if the studies such things involve have ministered, better than any other branches of mere discipline could, to form a well-proportioned, active, healthy, robust mind, master of its faculties, and capable of using them powerfully and effectively in any direction in which the exigencies of life may require them to be employed.

'Of the *uses* of this science of Moral Philosophy, one is the vigour and acuteness which it is apt to communicate to the faculties (P. 14.) . . . . The subtleties about mind and matter, cause and effect, perception and sensation, may be forgotten; but the power of nice discrimination, of arresting and examining the most subtle and evanescent ideas, and of striking rapidly and boldly into the faintest track of analogy, to see where it leads, and what it will produce; an emancipation from the *tyranny of words*, an undaunted intrepidity to push opinions up to their first causes;—all these virtues remain in the dexterous politician, the acute advocate, and the unerring judge. . . . . It may be of incalculable advantage to me, at an early period of life, to guard my understanding from the pernicious effects of association, though those effects cannot now be pointed out for the first time. I might have learned something about association, *without* the aid of this science, by the mere intercourse of life, but I should not have learned that lesson so early and so well. I am no longer left to gather this important law of my nature from accidental and disconnected remark, but it is brought fully and luminously before me;—I see that one man differs from another in the rank and nobleness of his understanding, in proportion as he counteracts this intellectual attraction of cohesion; I become permanently and vigilantly suspicious of this principle in my own mind, and when called upon in the great occasions of life to think and to act, I separate my judgment from the mere accidents of life, and decide, not according to the casualties of my fortune, but the unbiassed dictates of my reason: without this science I might have had a general and faint suspicion, with it I have a rooted and operative conviction of the errors to which my understanding is exposed.'

We shall not detain the reader any longer on that portion of the volume which embodies the first course of lectures, to which (if to any) the modest language of the *preface* is, as it seems to us, most applicable. Since they are, for the most part, a re-statement of the doctrines which the metaphysicians of the Scotch school had taught respecting the 'Faculties' of the mind; though illustrated with all the novelty and freshness which the author threw over everything he touched. These early lectures are also frequently imperfect, and in some places provokingly abound in those unhappy printers' 'stars,' which shed darkness instead of light.

The lectures on 'Wit and Humour,' a right facetious subject,



treated, one may be assured, *con amore*; as well as those on the 'Beautiful and Sublime,' and on the 'Faculties of Animals,' are un mutilated, and are distinguished, we think, by many original observations, as striking from their matter as their manner. It is from these we shall make our necessarily parsimonious selections.

The lectures on 'Wit' open with a very admirable and acute survey of the principal attempts to define that Protean thing. The author points out as he proceeds the defects of each; he shows that Barrow's celebrated description is but an enumeration of its forms, instead of a definition of its essence; that Cowley, in a similar manner, has exemplified instead of defining it; that Addison's papers on the subject in the 'Spectator' rather tell us how to 'form a just taste in wit than to explain what it is.'

'Dryden says of Wit, that it is a propriety of thoughts and words, or thoughts and words elegantly adapted to the subject; but there is a propriety of thoughts and words in one of Blair's sermons which I never yet heard praised for their wit. And the thoughts and words are elegantly adapted to the subject in Campbell's "Pleasures of Hope," which is something much *better* than a witty poem. Pope says of wit,—

"True wit is Nature to advantage drest,  
Oft thought before, but ne'er so well express't."

Then the *Philippics of Cicero*, the *Orations of Demosthenes*, are witty; Cæsar's Commentaries are witty; Massillon is one of the greatest wits that ever lived; the *Oraisons Funèbres* of Bossuet are prodigies of facetiousness. Sir Richard Blackmore's notion of wit is, that it is a series of high and exalted ferments. It very possibly *may* be; but, not exactly comprehending what is meant by a "series of high and exalted ferments," I do not think myself bound to waste much time in criticising the metaphysics of this learned physician.' (P. 117.)

"Wit," says Johnson, "may be more rigorously and philosophically considered as a kind of *concordia discors*,—a combination of dissimilar images, or discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike;" but, if this be true, then the discovery of the resemblance between diamond and charcoal, between acidification and combustion, are pure pieces of wit, and full of the most ingenious and exalted pleasantry.' (P. 120.)

'Hobbes defines Laughter to be a sudden glory arising from a sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves by comparison with infirmity of others, or our own former infirmity. . . . Taking the language of Hobbes to mean the sudden discovery of any inferiority, it will be very easy to show that such is *not* the explanation of that laughter excited by humour: for I may discover suddenly that a person has lost half-a-crown,—or that his tooth aches,—or that his

house is not so well built, or his coat not so well made, as mine; and yet none of these discoveries give me the slightest sensation of the humorous. If it be suggested that these proofs of inferiority are very slight, the theory of Hobbes is still more weakened by recurring to greater instances of inferiority: for the sudden information that any one of my acquaintance has broken his leg, or is completely ruined in his fortunes, has, decidedly, very little of humour in it;—at least, it is not very customary to be thrown into paroxysms of laughter by such sort of intelligence.' (P. 136.)

In the same manner, Locke's theory of wit is shown to include much more than is now or long has been ordinarily attached to the term. We doubt, however, whether our author (or Dugald Stewart, when commenting on the same passage of Locke) sufficiently adverted to the fact that the word 'wit' was used in Locke's day in a much less restricted sense than at present,—a sense, of which the expression 'mother wit' is a remnant,—when, in fact, a man of wit was nearly synonymous with a man of genius.

The theory which finds most favour in our author's eyes is that laid down by Campbell in his 'Philosophy of Rhetoric.' He describes it as the best to be found in our language, and, perhaps, on the whole with justice. But this, too, is faulty; at least it certainly includes far more than the word is now employed to designate.

The lecturer then proceeds to give us *his own* theory, which, as so often happens, is less satisfactory than his refutation of the theories of others. He defines 'wit' to be the result of 'any discovery of relations amongst our ideas,' attended by *surprise*, and that *only*. Surprise, he contends, and justly, often attends a perceived relation among ideas, provocative of far different emotions from that elicited by wit; as, for example, those of the beautiful or sublime; and that it is even true that there are many instances in which such 'surprising discovery of relations' has not the effect of wit, simply because all thought of wit is quenched in the beautiful or sublime. But he thinks, that where *surprise* only—unadulterated surprise—is the result, that then in every case we have *wit*; and that, if this be so, this constitutes its essence. He acknowledges that his definition had not given universal satisfaction, and that, to use his own expression, the week which followed the announcement of his definition was 'one of the most polemical that ever he remembered to have spent in his life.' He defends himself against his objectors, who adduced many examples of *facts* which occasion pure surprise, without producing any sense of facetiousness,—facts which all of us experience to be unpleasantly plentiful,

—by saying that he did not mean that any surprising *facts* will produce the effect of wit, but any surprising 'relations' amongst *ideas*. We cannot say that the theory, even thus limited, will satisfy us. It seems undeniable that there are many 'surprising relations' discovered amongst 'ideas;' as, for example, those by which the algebraist often most unexpectedly solves a difficulty, or those which characterise some half score of the ingenious interpretations of the mysterious number in the Apococalypse, which produce no sense of the 'witty' any more than of the 'beautiful.' They affect the mind in precisely the same manner as the discovery of the relations between the parts of some ingenious mechanical contrivance. Some of Sydney Smith's 'polemical' friends might probably plead even his own definition of wit against itself, and affirm, that though it was certainly a *surprise* to them to find 'any surprising relation between ideas' denominated the essence of wit, they felt none of the appropriate emotion of wit in that surprise.

It appears to us, we frankly confess, that, though a *pleased surprise* is a very general, perhaps uniform accompaniment and condition of the emotions both of 'beauty' and 'wit,' it is in itself as little the *essence* of one as of the other. Though it should be supposed uniformly coincident with both, it is obviously more extensive than either. If this be so, it will still require some limiting terms to define those cases, neither more nor less, in which the surprise, as felt, is coincident with wit. That is, the essence of wit is still to be sought.

Such a definition we certainly shall not attempt; and instead of pursuing this difficult subject, shall prefer, as our readers will also prefer, enjoying some of the passages of these lectures in which Sydney Smith has at all events exceedingly well *illustrated* the nature of wit, however he may have failed to exhibit its theory.

The remarks on the necessity that we should learn betimes how to defy ridicule, in adherence to our convictions of right, are admirable, and admirably expressed; nor less so those on the limits which wit must prescribe to itself if it would not render itself odious:—

'I have insisted, in the beginning of my lecture, on the great power of the ridiculous over the opinions of mankind; including in that term, wit, humour, and every other feeling which has laughter for its distinguishing characteristic.

'I know of no principle which it is of more importance to fix in the minds of young people, than that of the most determined resistance to the encroachments of ridicule. Give up to the world, and to the ridicule with which the world enforces its dominion, every

trifling question of manner and appearance : it is to toss courage and firmness to the winds to combat with the mass upon such subjects as these. But learn, from the earliest days, to inure your principles against the perils of ridicule : you can no more exercise your reason if you live in the constant dread of laughter, than you can enjoy your life if you are in the constant terror of death. If you think it right to differ from the times, and to make a stand for any valuable point of morals, do it, however rustic, however antiquated, however pedantic it may appear ;—do it, not for insolence, but *seriously and grandly*,—as a man who wore a soul of his own in his bosom, and did not wait till it was breathed into him by the breath of fashion. Let men call you mean, if you know you are just ; hypocritical, if you are honestly religious ; pusillanimous, if you feel that you are firm ; resistance soon converts unprincipled wit into sincere respect ; and no after time can tear from you those feelings which every man carries within him who has made a noble and successful exertion in a virtuous cause.' . . . (P. 134.)

' . . . It is beautiful to observe the boundaries which nature has affixed to the ridiculous, and to notice how soon it is swallowed up by the more illustrious feelings of our minds. Where is the heart so hard that could bear to see the awkward resources and contrivances of the poor turned into ridicule ? Who could laugh at the fractured, ruined body of a soldier ? Who is so wicked as to amuse himself with the infirmities of extreme old age ? or to find subject for humour in the weakness of a perishing, dissolving body ? Who is there that does not feel himself disposed to overlook the little peculiarities of the truly great and wise, and to throw a veil over that ridicule which they have redeemed by the magnitude of their talents, and the splendour of their virtues ? Who ever thinks of turning into ridicule our great and ardent hope of a world to come ? Whenever the man of humour meddles with these things, he is astonished to find that, in all the great feelings of their nature, the mass of mankind always think and act aright ; that they are ready enough to laugh,—but that they are quite as ready to drive away, with indignation and contempt, the light fool who comes with the feather of wit to crumble the bulwarks of truth, and to beat down the Temples of God !' (P. 139.)

The judicious and moderate estimate he forms of the value of this intellectual endowment has already been referred to as a signal proof of the equilibrium of our author's judgment, naturally disposed, as he must have been, to regard with favour a quality which he himself so highly possessed. It is thus he speaks of it :—

' I wish, after all I have said about wit and humour, I could satisfy myself of their good effects upon the character and disposition ; but I am convinced the probable tendency of both is to corrupt the understanding and the heart. I am not speaking of wit where it is kept down by more serious qualities of mind, and thrown into the background of the picture ; but where it stands out boldly and emphatically, and is evidently the master quality in any particular mind.

Professed wits, though they are generally courted for the amusement they afford, are seldom respected for the qualities they possess. 'The habit of seeing things in a witty point of view increases, and makes incursions, from its own proper regions, upon principles and opinions which are ever held sacred by the wise and good. . . . (P. 150.)

. . . So far the world, in judging of wit where it has swallowed up all other qualities, judge aright; but I doubt if they are sufficiently indulgent to this faculty where it exists in a *lesser* degree, and as one out of many other ingredients of the *understanding*. There is an association in men's minds between dulness and wisdom, amusement and folly, which has a very powerful influence in decision upon character, and is not overcome without considerable difficulty. The reason is, that the *outward* signs of a dull man and a wise man are the same, and so are the outward signs of a frivolous man and a witty man; and we are not to expect that the majority will be disposed to look to much *more* than the outward sign. I believe the fact to be, that wit is very seldom the *only* eminent quality which resides in the mind of any man: it is commonly accompanied by many other talents of every description, and ought to be considered as a strong evidence of a fertile and superior understanding. . . . I have talked of the *danger* of wit: I do not mean by that to enter into common-place declamation against faculties because they *are* dangerous. Wit is dangerous, eloquence is dangerous, a talent for observation is dangerous, *every* thing is dangerous that has efficacy and vigour for its characteristics; nothing is safe but mediocrity. . . . But when wit is combined with sense and information,—when it is softened by benevolence, and restrained by strong principle,—when it is in the hands of a man who can use it and despise it; who can be witty, and something much *better* than witty; who loves honour, justice, decency, good nature, morality, and religion ten thousand times better than wit,—wit is *then* a beautiful and delightful part of our nature.' (P. 151.)

Our author dismisses 'puns,' 'charades,' and the other diminutive forms of wit, with the following summary expression of his contempt:—

'I have very little to say about puns; they are in very bad repute, and so they *ought* to be. The wit of language is so miserably inferior to the wit of ideas, that it is very deservedly driven out of good company. Sometimes, indeed, a pun makes its appearance which seems, for a moment, to redeem its species; but we must not be deceived by them: it is a radically bad race of wit. By unrelenting persecution it has been at last got under, and driven into cloisters from whence it must never again be suffered to emerge into the light of the world. One invaluable blessing produced by the banishment of punning, is an immediate reduction of the number of wits. It is a wit of so low an order, and in which some sort of progress is so easily made, that the number of those endowed with the gift of wit would be nearly equal to those endowed with the gift of speech. The condition of putting together ideas, in order to be witty, operates much in the

same salutary manner as the condition of finding rhymes in poetry;—it reduces the number of performers to those who have vigour enough to overcome incipient difficulties, and makes a sort of provision that that which need not be done at all should be done well whenever it is done. For we may observe, that mankind are always more fastidious about that which is pleasing than they are about that which is useful. A common-place piece of morality is much more easily pardoned than a common-place piece of poetry or of wit; because it is absolutely necessary for the well-being of society that the rules of morality should be frequently repeated and enforced; and though, in any individual instance, the thing may be badly done, the sacred necessity of the practice itself atones, in some degree, for the individual failure: but, as there is no absolute necessity that men should be either wits or poets, we are less inclined to tolerate their mediocrity in superfluities. If a man has ordinary chairs and tables, no one notices it; but if he sticks vulgar, gaudy pictures on his walls, which he need not have at all, every one laughs at him for his folly.' . . . (P. 131.)

'I shall say nothing of charades, and such sort of unpardonable trumpery. If charades are made at all, they should be made without benefit of clergy;—the offender should instantly be hurried off to execution, and be cut off in the middle of his dulness, without being allowed to explain to the executioner why his first is like his second, or what is the resemblance between his fourth and his ninth.' (P. 143.)

The following observations on the degree in which wit is susceptible of *culture* are curious and just:—

'It is imagined that wit is a sort of inexplicable visitation; that it comes and goes with the rapidity of lightning; and that it is quite as unattainable as beauty or just proportion. I am so much of a contrary way of thinking, that I am convinced a man might sit down as systematically and as successfully to the study of wit, as he might to the study of mathematics; and I would answer for it that, by giving up only six hours a day to being witty, he should come on prodigiously before midsummer, so that his friends should hardly know him again. For what is there to hinder the mind from gradually acquiring a habit of attending to the lighter relations of ideas in which wit consists? Punning grows upon every body; and punning is the wit of words. I do not mean to say that it is so easy to acquire a habit of discovering new relations in *ideas* as in *words*; but the difficulty is not so much greater as to render it insuperable to habit.' (P. 129.)

Our author's prelections on Beauty are eminently 'beautiful,' but we cannot say that he appears quite consistent in his theory respecting it. We need not remind our readers what a 'questio vexata' this has ever been in metaphysical criticism. Like her in whom Beauty was so pre-eminently embodied, Beauty itself has been the source of 'dire contentions' between our

critical Greeks and Trojans. From the day when Plato treated it in the 'Hippias Major' down to very recent times, men were as much and ludicrously in doubt about the nature and cause of what all were so familiar with, as about the theory of any facts whatever.

In general, our author accedes to the theory adopted with different modifications by most modern metaphysicians;—that the beautiful is to be sought, not in some quality or qualities of external nature itself, but in the *mind*,—in pleasurable associations; that these may be of infinitely various kinds, and exist in all sorts of proportions; and that the emotion of the beautiful will depend for its intensity on the number, duration, individual force, and concurrent influence of these harmonising elements.

This doctrine, we say, (in the main that of Alison,) our author accepts; yet, it must be confessed, he does not very consistently adhere to it. For though he has defined Beauty to be 'a feeling of the mind,' (p. 173.) he on the next page (p. 174.) speaks of Beauty as 'a quality of matter,' and even deviates into the absolute heresy, that there are many objects which have beauty in themselves, and immediately affect the mind with it.

If by this last expression he only meant (and we half suspect that he did only mean, or *would* only have meant had he paused to adjust fully his own conceptions) that there are, as Lord Jeffrey says in his admirable critique on Alison\*, many cases in which the emotion of the beautiful springs up at once in the presence of certain objects, and does not wait to be slowly deposited as the product of those long trains of associations to which Alison attributes it, few would have objected to the expression; rather, most would have accepted it as a valuable correction.

Further, if he had merely meant, that the sensational and organic delight with which so many external objects, and their combinations, impress us, forms an immediate and appreciable element in the associations which determine the emotion of beauty, —however inferior in power may be the associations which are

---

\* *Art. Beauty, Encyc. Brit.* This exquisite piece of criticism (an expansion of an article in an early number of this Journal) is well worthy of separate publication. On our once expressing to Lord Jeffrey a wish to see it in such a form, he said that he could have no objection, if the proprietors of the Encyclopædia had none. As so many of the contributions to that great work have been given to the public in a separate form, it may be hoped that this also will at length be added to the number.

so founded on them, to other and higher associations dependent on intellectual and moral causes,—few, when their attention was fairly called to the fact, would have been disposed to disagree with him. It is a point, however, which has been too much overlooked. Perhaps, even Lord Jeffrey's critique has hardly given sufficient prominence to it. Had it been duly borne in mind, it would have removed that apparent paradox which seems to postpone the emotion of beauty (not merely higher degrees of it, but the emotion itself,) to a long, tardy, and intricate compilation of associations. There seems something more peculiar still in the special case of an ear for music. But, surely it is not difficult to suppose that the delightful sensations with which the eye and the ear, and all the senses, are regaled amidst woodland scenery on a fine spring day—the mellow tints—the golden broken light—the variety of light and shade—the pleasing effects of the play of both under the waving foliage in the green forest glade—the whispering of the winds in the trees—the warbling of birds in the branches—the bright colours and fragrant scent of flowers—constitute a very positive item in the sum of associations on which the emotion of beauty is founded, and instantaneously lead to that emotion, however capable it may be (as we see it is) of being indefinitely intensified in relation to particular localities, by repetition of the pleasure, by all the bonds of remembrance with such scenes, by all the social pleasures with which such scenes may be enriched,—by all, in a word, which a cultivated and happy mind can bring to bear upon it.

But, alas! for the consistency of metaphysicians. Our lecturer certainly *says* something much more questionable, even if he would not on maturer thoughts have adhered to it. He expressly says that the eye has *beauty* for its object (at least in many cases) just as the organ of smell has *fragrance* for its object;—not merely that the eye and the ear have their appropriated *sensations* of delight from colours and sounds, as the nose from scents and the palate from flavour; but that the emotion of beauty, (undoubtedly in many cases the instantaneous *reflex* of delighted sensation, though purely mental in itself,) is the direct object of the eye. He says, 'It seems strange to me, that men should doubt any more of the gluttony of the *eye*, than of the gluttony of the mouth. As the palate feasts upon the savoury and sweet, the ear feasts upon melody, and the eye gorges upon light and colour, till it aches with pleasure.' He contends, in opposition to Alison and Jeffrey, that matter is capable of immediately exciting *emotion*; and seems to think that he has proved this in proving,



what none deny, that it is capable of exciting agreeable or disagreeable sensations. This is of course true, and hence the approximate uniformity of men's notions of beauty; because external nature, affecting them in the same manner, will necessarily lead, for the most part, to the same associations, and therefore to a similar conception of the beautiful. But the difference of the degree of this emotion, in relation to the same objects, in different men,—the absence of it in many, in relation to certain objects which inspire others with rapture,—the power of investing with beauty objects once indifferent, or even disagreeable,—the fluctuation of the standard of taste in different ages and nations,—even, in some cases, the transfer of the emotion to opposite objects in the history of the same individual, all show that association, and not sensation, is the key to its explanation. This theory, and this alone, accounts both for the approximate uniformity, and the limited diversities of taste in mankind at large.

But whatever he means, or does not mean, it is impossible, here or elsewhere, to withhold our admiration of the manner in which the author has illustrated and adorned his theme, and of the many original and beautiful reflections which are interspersed amidst some rather questionable speculations.

We have left ourselves no space for extracts from the Lectures on the Beautiful; but we cannot help extracting the following brief paragraphs on the effect of custom and proportion in modifying our idea of beauty:—

'But in order to show the effect of custom upon the beautiful, take a chin, which is of no use at all. A chin ending in a very sharp angle, would be perfect deformity. A man whose chin terminated in a point, would be under the immediate necessity of retiring to America; he would be a perfect horror; and for no other reason that I can possibly see, but that Nature has shown no intention of making such a chin,—we have never been accustomed to see such chins. Nature, we are quite certain, did not intend that the chin should be brought to a perfect angle, nor that it should be perfectly circular, and therefore either of these extremes is a deformity. Now, something considerably removed from the perfect circle and the perfect angle, is the chin we have been most accustomed to see, and which, for that reason, we most approve of.' (P. 187.)

'Mr. Burke contends, and in my humble opinion with great success, that proportion is never of *itself* the original cause of beauty. It is the cause of beauty, as it is an indication of strength and utility in buildings,—of swiftness in animals,—of any feeling morally beautiful; and it is agreeable, as it is customary, in animals, or the proof of the absence of deformity; but no proportion of itself, and without one of these reasons, ever pleases. No man would contend Nature ever intended that 6 to 2, or 9 to 14, are perfection; that the moment a

monkey could be discovered and brought to light, the length of whose ear was precisely the cube root of the length of his tail, that he ought to be set up as a model of perfect conformation to the whole simious tribe. Certain proportions are beautiful, as they indicate skill, swiftness, convenience, strength, or historical association; and then philosophers copy these proportions, and determine that they must be originally and abstractedly beautiful,—applying that to the sign, which is only true of the thing indicated by the sign.' (P. 190.)

Two of the best lectures in the volume are those entitled, 'Faculties of Animals and Men,' and 'Faculties of Beasts.' If one had picked up this portion of the manuscript by the road-side, one could have sworn to its authorship. How characteristic is the opening paragraph:—

'I confess I treat on this subject with some degree of apprehension and reluctance; because, I should be very sorry to do injustice to the poor brutes, who have no professors to revenge their cause by lecturing on *our* faculties; and at the same time I know there is a very strong anthropical party, who view all eulogiums on the brute creation with a very considerable degree of suspicion; and look upon every compliment which is paid to the ape, as high treason to the dignity of man.

'There may, perhaps, be more of rashness and ill-fated security in my opinion, than of magnanimity or liberality; but I confess I feel myself so much at my ease about the superiority of mankind,—I have such a marked and decided contempt for the understanding of every baboon I have yet seen,—I feel so sure that the blue ape without a tail will never rival us in poetry, painting, and music,—that I see no reason whatever why justice may not be done to the few fragments of soul, and tatters of understanding, which they may really possess. I have sometimes, perhaps, felt a little uneasy at Exeter Change, from contrasting the monkeys with the 'prentice boys who are teasing them; but a few pages of Locke, or a few lines of Milton, have always restored me to tranquillity, and convinced me that the superiority of man had nothing to fear.' (P. 238.)

In an enumeration of the causes of man's superiority to the lower animals there occur the following singular yet apposite illustrations:—

'His gregarious nature is another cause of man's superiority over all other animals. A lion lies under a hole in a rock; and if any other lion happens to pass by, they fight. Now, whoever gets a habit of lying under a hole in a rock, and fighting with every gentleman who passes near him, cannot possibly make any progress. Every man's understanding and acquirements, how great and extensive soever they may appear, are made up from the contributions of his friends and companions.' . . .

'If lions would consort together, and growl out the observations they have made, about killing sheep and shepherds, the most likely places for catching a calf grazing, and so forth, they could not fail to

improve; because they would be actuated by such a wide range of observation, and operating by the joint force of so many minds. . . . A third method in which man gains the dominion over other animals, is, by the structure of his body, and the mechanism of his hands. Suppose, with all our understanding, it had pleased Providence to make us like lobsters, or to imprison us in shells like cray-fish, I very much question if the monkeys would not have converted us into sauce; nor can I conceive any possible method by which such a fate could have been averted. Suppose man, with the same faculties, the same body, and the hands and feet of an ox,—what then would have been his fate?' (Pp. 267, 268.)

'The fact seems to be, that though almost every quality of mind we possess, can be traced in some trifling degree in brutes; yet *that* degree, compared with the extent in which the same quality is observable in man, is very low and inconsiderable. For instance, we cannot say that animals are devoid of curiosity, but they have a very slight degree of curiosity: they imitate, but they imitate very slightly in comparison with men; they cannot imitate anything very difficult; and many of them hardly imitate at all: they abstract, but they cannot make such compound abstractions as men do; they have no such compounded abstractions as city, prudence, fortitude, parliament, and justice: they reason, but their reasonings are very short, and very obvious: they invent, but their inventions are extremely easy, and not above the reach of a human idiot. The story I quoted from Bailly, about the ape and the walnuts, is one of the most extraordinary I ever read; but what a wretched limit of intellect does it imply, to be cited as an instance of extraordinary sagacity!' (P. 270.)

The whole of this interesting subject is treated with great power. Instinct—its nature and limits—its resemblances and dissimilarities to reason—the 'vain philosophies' which would exalt brutes to men or degrade men to brutes, or degrade brutes below themselves—even into mere machines,—are discussed in the spirit of true philosophy, and with the vivacity of genuine wit. Maintaining the just prerogatives of the 'sovereign of 'this lower world,' our author yet defends the claims of the subject brutes with an impartiality which may make the 'lion' cease to regret that his race have no 'painters.'

In conclusion; though some may probably deem that this volume contains too much merriment for so grave a theme, and that philosophy is here masquerading it a little too lightly for her character,—the fault, if fault it be, may well be pardoned. It is rarely indeed that metaphysics have so transgressed. For one vessel (laden with a similar cargo) that rides too high in the water for want of ballast, there are a hundred whose weight sinks them to the water's edge, and thousands whose too ponderous freight has sent them to the bottom, before they were fairly afloat. It is, in our judgment, a recommendation of these

lectures that they may induce some to read about Mental Philosophy who would otherwise have never read about it at all. He who cannot bear philosophy except in conjunction with a congenial gravity can find plenty of works to his mind.

ART. III.—1. *First and Second Reports of the Commissioners for enquiring into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts.* London: 1844 and 1845.

2. *First, Second, and Third Reports of the Metropolitan Sanitary Commission.* London: 1847 and 1848.

3. *Historical and Statistical Account of the Present System of supplying the Metropolis with Water.* By JOSEPH FLETCHER, Esq. Journal of the Statistical Society of London. June, 1845.

4. *Supply of Water to London from the River Thames at Henley.* London: 1849.

OLD STOW has preserved a tract written in the reign of Henry II., by Fitz-Stephen, Thomas a Beckett's secretary, in which he gives an account of London at that time, and thus affords us the means of comparing ourselves with our ancestors. As a point worthy of notice, he records that 'the only plagues of London are immoderate drinking of idle fellows, and often fires.' This statement we fear is as true now as it was then. He further asserts, with a gallantry worthy of his Norman blood, that the city dames were very Sabines in chastity; 'Urbis matronæ ipsæ Sabinae sunt.' Though not Normans, and speaking from our own limited personal knowledge, we will be bold to declare that this statement also is as true now as it was then. But when he goes on to say 'there are also about London, on the north of the suburbs, choice fountains of water, sweet, wholesome, and clear, streaming forth among the glistening pebble stones,' our hearts fail us, and we have no courage to pursue the comparison any farther. It may, however, not be altogether useless, if we place before our readers a sketch of the actual condition of London in respect of its supply of water, tracing the measures which have brought it into its present difficulty, and indicating the direction in which the remedy lies.

In the time of the Conqueror, says Stow, 'This city of London was watered (besides the famous river of Thames on the south part) with the River of Wells, as it was then called, on the west—with a water called Wallbrook running through the midst of the city, severing the heart thereof.' Then they had

Holy Well, Clement's Well, and Clerke's Well\*, besides the 'Horse poole' in Smithfield 'sometime a great water,' and another near the parish church of St. Giles's without Cripple-gate. Langbourne Water was a 'great stream' breaking out of the ground in Fenchurch Street, and running down Lombard Street to the Thames. There were also private wells; 'and 'after this manner was the city then served with sweet and fresh 'water.'

But in process of time, 'the number of citizens being mightily 'increased, they were forced to seek sweet water abroad;' and having turned their eyes to the remote district of Tyburn, one Gilbert Sanford, at the personal request of King Henry III., granted permission to the citizens to take water from thence in leaden pipes, for the supply of 'the great conduit in West 'Cheap builded in the year 1285.' In 1438, the Corporation, under the same pressure, went to Highbury; next year to the Abbot of Westminster's springs at Paddington, and even to Hackney and Islington. In the next century, about 1568, having exhausted all the supplies within their reach, they raised water by machinery from the Thames to a conduit on Dowgate hill. We recommend to the consideration of the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London the way in which their predecessors attended to the supply of water to the city.

'On the 18th September, 1562, the Lord Mayor (Harper), 'aldermen, and many worshipful persons, and divers of the 'masters and wardens of the twelve companies, rid to the Conduit Heads for to see them, after the old custom; and afore 'dinner they hunted the hare, and killed her, and thence to 'dinner at the head of the Conduit. And after dinner they 'went to hunting the fox: there was a great cry for a mile, 'and at length the hounds killed him at the end of St. Giles's. 'Great hallowing at his death, and blowing of hornes; and 'thence the Lord Mayor, with all his company, rode through 'London to his place in Lombard Street.'

In 1582, Peter Morrice, a Dutchman, raised water by a wheel from the Thames at London Bridge, and conveyed it by

---

\* St. Clement's Well was close to Clement's Inn. Clerke's Well, or Clerkenwell, was near Clerkenwell Church. The church was named from the well, and the well took its name from the parish clerks in London; 'who, of old time, were accustomed there yearly 'to assemble, and to play some large history of Holy Scripture.' In 1409 these much-enduring men played, at the Skinner's Well, a play which lasted eight days: and no wonder, for 'it was of matter from 'the Creation of the World!' A large history, indeed.

small pipes to the houses—the greatest improvement in the distribution of water that had yet been made. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, the city of London formed the really creditable project of bringing water to London from the Chadwell and Amwell springs, twenty-one miles off in Hertfordshire. Their conceptions had however exceeded their energy, and the scheme would have failed, at all events for a time, but for the accidental union in one man of three conditions which command success. Sir Hugh Middleton, a citizen of London and a goldsmith (a trade in those days almost invariably connected with money dealing and financial operations), had been engaged in extensive mining transactions in Wales. In these occupations he had realised an immense fortune, and had acquired an unusual amount of practical engineering knowledge; to which qualifications he added the rarer one of invincible resolution. Wealth, skill, and determination form in combination a power which accomplishes apparent impossibilities. He offered singly to bear the burden which was too heavy for the city of London, and successfully achieved what he had so boldly undertaken. On the 29th of September, 1613, the New River flowed into the town. At first it appeared that the Corporation had made a good bargain: for thirty years the dividends were not more than 5*l.* per share; Sir Hugh, who had embarked his whole fortune in the scheme, sold his shares and died, comparatively speaking, a poor man. King Charles inherited from King James half the stock of the Company, and sold it for 500*l.* a year. But the practical monopoly of supplying a growing city with one of the primary necessities of life must sooner or later be profitable, and the dividends have gradually risen from 5*l.* to 617*l.* per share. Such are the results to an individual of undertaking a speculation offering a prospective rather than an immediate profit, and to a city of sacrificing the future to the present, and permitting the privilege of supplying its inhabitants with water to pass into the hands of a trading company.

The example set by the Corporation was gradually followed, and water companies appeared in the other districts. On the south of the Thames, the Southwark Company was established about the middle of the last century, the Lambeth Company in 1785, and the Vauxhall Company in 1805. On the north bank, the New River Company, the Chelsea Company (formed in 1703), and some smaller companies, supplied the whole of the town up to 1810; but then the East London, West Middlesex, and Grand Junction Companies sprang up; and, after a des-

perate competition, the larger companies absorbed the smaller, and partitioned out the metropolis among themselves.

One half of the population of London, who live to the east of a line drawn from Charing Cross, by Tottenham Court Road, to the Hampstead Road, are supplied from the small Chadwell spring in Hertfordshire, and from the river Lea, with water which, though unfiltered, has deposited much of its sediment in settling reservoirs. The rest of London is supplied from the Thames at various points between Waterloo Bridge and Kew Bridge at Brentford; the river being ponded back by the tide as far as Teddington Lock, nineteen miles above London Bridge, and the tide itself flowing back above the highest point whence any of the companies draw water. The West Middlesex and the Lambeth Companies give the unfiltered water of the Thames,—the others filter it more or less perfectly.

Of the two great uses of water, drinking and cleanliness, the latter is nearly as important as the former, and requires a vastly greater quantity: and as, in a town, whatever is to be removed from a house must also be carried beyond the limits of the town, the difficulty increases as the town increases. The expense of doing this by labour is so great, that, practically, in a large town, almost all that is not removed by some cheap process is not removed at all. The cheapest mode of removing matter is by suspending it in solution in a moving current; and it has been happily provided that the greater part of the refuse and filth of a town answers to the required condition, and may be mechanically suspended in water. No town, therefore, can be considered properly supplied with water unless the quality is wholesome, the quantity sufficient to sweep away all impurities beyond its utmost limit, and the mode of distribution such that no individual is left out; for though people will go to water to quench their thirst, water must be brought to them, or they will neglect cleanliness.

It is now our business to show how far these results have been obtained in London, where water has been for more than two centuries an article of trade. And, first, as to quality. The eastern half of London is supplied from the river Lea, with some assistance from the Chadwell spring. Passing over the objectionable character of the open channel of the New River, we would ask our readers to inspect, on any large map, the district of which the Lea receives the immediate drainage. It is one of the most populous in all England. The town of Tottenham alone contains 9000 inhabitants. It is on the line of the great north road; and, for twenty miles, the chain of towns and villages is almost unbroken. The Lea was so palpably objec-

tionable, that it was only resorted to, out of necessity, when the Hertfordshire springs had failed. Moreover, it is becoming worse every day, from the rapid increase of the population on its banks; indeed, only one source of supply worse than itself could be found, and *that* has been selected by the other companies. The rest of London, as we have said, is supplied by them from the Thames within the tideway. The real meaning of such a statement is this. The refuse and dirt from two millions of individuals,—the enormous accumulation of waste and dead animal and vegetable matter,—the blood and offal of slaughter-houses,—the outpourings from gas-works, dye-works, breweries, distilleries, glue-works, bone-works, tanneries, chemical and other works,—and a thousand nameless pollutions,—all find their way into the Thames. The mixture is next washed backwards and forwards by the tide; and, having been thoroughly stirred up and finely comminuted by the unceasing splash of 298 steamboats, is then pumped up for the use of the wealthiest city in the world!

Twenty years ago, a Royal Commission reported that the Thames, when free from extraneous matter, may fairly be called pure; but, 'as it approaches the metropolis, it becomes loaded 'with a quantity of filth which renders it disgusting to the senses, 'and improper to be employed in the preparation of food.' They expressed, in gentle phrase, their opinion, that this water 'can- 'not, even when clarified by filtration, be pronounced entirely 'free from the suspicion of general insalubrity.' We should think not, indeed; for filtration only removes the mechanical, leaving unaffected the mineral, vegetable, and animal impurities. They also thought that 'there were no grounds for 'assuming the probability of any improvement in the state of 'the water drawn from the London district;' more especially as it had been considerably deteriorated within the ten years previous. We heartily concur in this also; and, so far from dreaming of improvement, we conceive we have something very like a mathematical demonstration that what was bad then is abominable now, and will be intolerable ten years hence. It was said that fish had deserted the London waters; and that even Dutch eels, when placed in it, gave up their miserable lives. We believe this was an exaggeration; at least, when on a visit to a friend who has the happiness of residing in the dominions of the Grand Junction Company, we ourselves found a very lively shrimp in our water bottle. But when we read that there are 141 public sewers between London and Battersea bridges,—that Richmond, Isleworth, Brentford, Mortlake, Chiswick, and Hammersmith furnish 68 more,—and that the



whole of their contents are received into the Thames, and returned by the reflux of the tide,—we perceive a state of things which renders exaggeration truly superfluous.

Bad as this water is, it is made very much worse by an arrangement which is in operation all over London, and is the direct result of the principle of trade. To avoid what, in the language of the water companies, is called *wasting* water,—though it is a strange term for washing away filth,—the supply is *intermittent*, necessitating the use of cisterns. The rich use large leaden tanks; the rest of the inhabitants—that is, nine tenths of the whole population—use the best substitute they can afford to purchase, from a wine pipe holding 130 gallons, down to a butter tub which costs a shilling. All the water brought to London is full of organic matter, and, therefore, always ready to reproduce vegetable or animal life. Any one may convince himself of this by letting water stand in his water bottle for a few days, when he will find the bottom of the bottle beginning to show a covering of vegetation. Generally, however, this experiment is carried on in the tank, out of sight. The process of vegetation is invariably accompanied by the breeding of insects. Professor Clark says, that animalcules abound in the waters of all the London companies. Once, out of curiosity, he counted the number of insects visible to the naked eye in a gallon, and found them to be 450. The real number was, he says, of course much greater. The specimen did not strike an eye accustomed to the London waters as at all unusual; and the Professor, prudently enough, ‘made no observations as to the smaller creatures visible only by the microscope.’ But if such is the condition of water taken from the cistern of a gentleman’s house, what is likely to be that from the half-rotten, dirty, uncovered butts and tubs of the poorer classes,—carpeted with a layer of soot, dust, and dirt,—into which insects scramble, and at the bottom of which swallows, young birds, rats, and cats are not unfrequently found?

But whatever may be the evils arising from impurity in the quality, those caused by a deficiency in quantity, and an intermittent distribution, are infinitely more deplorable. We are not now speaking of the houses of the rich, where, by large tanks and scientific appliances, much that is offensive to the senses may be removed; but of the houses where the millions live,—men whose wages vary from twelve to eighteen shillings a week, and whose lot chains them to particular localities. The first cost of laying pipes to inferior tenements is something: the water company, true to the commercial principle, throws the burden and risk on the landlord; the landlord, who lives in a

good house elsewhere, throws it on the tenant; the tenant, being only a tenant, of course refuses to expend money for the benefit of the landlord, and water is not laid on. Closets require cisterns raised six feet from the ground; but these then become subject to an extra charge for 'high service,' and so the whole apparatus is dispensed with. Though without a system of drains a large supply of water is rather injurious than otherwise, yet without a plentiful supply there can be no drainage at all; and therefore, when water is not brought to these houses, refuse of all descriptions remains unremoved, accumulating in and around the houses, in the courts, in back yards, in cellars, and in cesspools. The most vivid imagination cannot adequately conceive the consequences of this; and if we were to transcribe the evidence which has been collected upon this branch of the subject, our readers would turn from the page with loathing. Little do the rich know of the state of their poorer neighbours, or of the masses of filth and misery from which they are separated only by a party wall. Behind some of the best streets in London scenes may be witnessed at which humanity shudders.

In populous districts it is common for eighteen or twenty houses to be built round a court: at one end is a water-cock, the water being turned on three times a week, and sometimes for half an hour on Sundays also. Those who can then attend fill a bucket or butter tub, and carry it to their rooms; those who, from any cause, cannot attend at the proper moment, go without water for the next two days.

Sometimes the cock is out of order, or the landlord has fallen into arrear with the water rent and the supply been in consequence cut off, and twenty families are deprived of all means of cleanliness. The husbands being away at their work, the wives must fetch the water, and they are often physically unable to carry it up stairs; — thence comes *economy* of water; and what that implies Dr. Toynbee tells us. Water, already filthy from having been used to wash clothes, is used over and over again for the same purpose: children are left dirty, greens are put into the pot without being washed, and the smallest possible quantity is used in cooking. Having to attend three children ill with scrofulous affections of the eyes and throat, he found them all rarely washed and in an extremely filthy condition, because the mother, once in respectable circumstances, was so far advanced in pregnancy as to be unable to go up and down stairs. Often, after dressing a patient, he could get no water in the room, sometimes not in the house. What were called clean towels were so offensive from having been washed in dirty water as to be unfit for use. He continually visited houses where the smell

was unbearable, but the windows were never opened on account of the still more pestilential effluvium without. Within a district supplied by the New River Company, in the court and yards outside the houses was a mass of putrid, fermenting filth, and the subsoil was saturated with offensive matter till it could take up no more. In such a locality, the houses, the inmates, and everything around them became unavoidably 'horribly filthy.'

There is a most fatal and certain connexion between physical uncleanness and moral pollution: the condition of a population becomes invariably assimilated to that of their habitations. There can be no sight more painful than that of a healthy, rosy, active countrywoman brought to one of these dwellings. For a time there is a desperate exertion to keep the place clean; several times in the forenoon is the pavement in the front of the house washed, but as often does the oozing filth creep along the stones, and she feels at length that her labour is in vain. The noxious exhalations infuse their poison into her system, and her energies droop. Then she becomes sick, or the supply has been cut off, or she has missed her turn, or her little store of water has been upset or stolen, and, cleanliness becoming impossible, she gets accustomed to its absence, and gradually sinks into the ways of her neighbours. The art of concealing dirt is substituted for the habit of cleanliness; she becomes a dirty, debilitated slattern, followed by sickly, scrofulous, feverish children; and she falls through successive stages of degradation, till, physical wretchedness having done its worst, she reaches the lowest of all, that in which she has ceased to complain. The fate of the children is, if possible, more heart-breaking. All idea of sobriety, all notion of self-respect, all sense of modesty, all instinct of decency is nipped in the bud: they congregate in masses, and mix with the worst vagrants. At last some dreadful fever forces on the notice of the public the existence of their squalid dens of misery; such as those in the Saffron Hill district, — where twenty-five people were found living in a room sixteen feet square, — where a man and his wife and four children, occupying one room, took in seven lodgers, — and where one house contained a hundred and twenty-six people, and only six or seven beds. These people save nothing, but invariably spend all they earn in drink; and with that precocious depravity too surely evinced by human beings when herded together like beasts, the young of both sexes live together from the ages of twelve and thirteen years.

It is right that these things should be made known — it is well that they should be considered. We have commission after commission to inquire — we have one pestilence after

another to warn us that the destroying angel is at hand: we wait for twenty years, weighing in a balance the interests of water companies, the contingent losses of millers, the hardness of water from a well, and the impurity of water from the river; and in the meantime tens of thousands of our citizens are dragged down morally and socially by all manner of filth and wretchedness, and hurried through a degraded and miserable existence to an untimely end. While our discussions go on, they are dropping into their graves. The worst water in the Thames would be an unspeakable blessing to the denizens of Red Lion Court. We fill our gaols with felons, and we have City Missions, and put our trust in education; but the influences of filth are stronger than the policeman, the schoolmaster, and the preacher; and we ought, by this time, to have learned that the very foundation of moral training in a London tenement is a pipe of wholesome water from the top to the bottom of the house.

But then the cost of an altered system! Few will ask that question who have steadily contemplated the cost of the present system. We would entreat our readers just to glance at the evidence of Dr. Southwood Smith, physician to the London Fever Hospital, and of Mr. Toynbee, surgeon of the St. George's and St. James's Dispensary, and visitor for the Westminster General Dispensary.

Fever is beyond all comparison the disease of adult life, and, more than any other, depends upon causes within our own control: at least those forms of it, which arise from the decomposition of animal and vegetable matter. A short period is mercifully given to us before putrefaction begins, within which we may remove the evil; but when that period has expired, poisonous gases are generated, and the seed of fever sown. In many places in London, on account of the want of water and proper drains, this removal is not at all, and in others very tardily, effected: we have therefore localities from which fever is never absent,—these are the centres whence sickness is always emanating,—the ever-burning matches by which the flames of disease are re-lighted. And the social and moral evils of fever, its pauperising effects, and prodigious expense, whether in a public or private view, are not easily described: for much as we are alarmed by cholera, the returns show that in any one year fever kills as many as cholera.

The rate of mortality in the east of London is double that in the west. To persons accustomed to the study of medical statistics, this simple statement would be sufficient; they would at once see the depth of misery which it indicates. But to others we must place it in a more familiar light. Out of every

two persons who die in the east of London, one perishes from preventible causes. From twenty to thirty thousand of the labouring population of London are killed every year by causes which, if we chose, we might expel by a current of water. Though we do not take these persons out of their houses and murder them, we do the same thing in effect,—we neglect them in their poisonous homes, and leave them there to a lingering but a certain death.

The peculiar evil of fever is, that it seizes upon the labouring classes especially, and at the most valuable period of their existence. Those attacked between the ages of 20 and 30 years are equal in number to those attacked at all other ages put together. At that time of life the working classes are generally married, and have children to support; so that not only heads of families are most liable to this malady, but are most liable at that precise period of life when they have a young family entirely dependent upon their exertions. Females, too, seem to be more susceptible of this disease, perhaps are more constantly exposed to its causes, than males; and when smitten by it, they can neither nurse their children, nor attend to any one of those duties, which unless a working man's wife personally discharges, the house becomes a scene of disorder and distress.

The indirect effects of sickness are, moreover, far more hurtful, though less observable, than the direct effects of mortal disease. Those who merely suffer from fever are about twelve times as many as those who perish. The poison arising from animal or vegetable decomposition acts as a sedative; it lowers the tone, unstrings the nerves, and brings on physical languor and mental apathy. Persons affected by it become unfit for, and have a hatred of, labour. There is no expedient they will not seek in order to escape from toil. Under this depression, and as a relief from a peculiar inward *sinking* feeling, they have a craving for the stimulus of ardent spirits to an extent inconceivable by persons in happier circumstances; it amounts to a passion, and these debilitated beings are unable to control it. The same poison, by deranging and weakening the digestive organs, produces complaints of a scrofulous and consumptive character, generally accompanied by a feverish and nervous irritability, constantly urging them to the unrestrained gratification of their appetites; and so the process of degradation goes forward. The effort to struggle against the surrounding mass of filth and wretchedness, is given up in sheer hopelessness, and the man's best energies are sapped by the irresistible poison, even while he is endeavouring to resist its influence. The class of workmen that in other places drink nothing but water, in London drink anything but water, so bad is it. The labourer comes

home tired, and is glad to escape from the dirt and discomfort—the poisonous atmosphere of his home—to a pothouse. In the morning there is no water to make him a cup of coffee, — again he is driven to the beer-shop; overpowered by the internal craving and external temptations, he inevitably becomes a drunkard, and, in time, unequal to hard work. Soon the comforts of life are gone; then its decencies are neglected; the moral feelings, one after the other, are broken down before the most sordid appetites, alike ungovernable and insatiable: he is crushed by drunkenness, profligacy, and poverty, and sinks from one stage of vice and misery to another, till the intellectual faculties become dimmed, all moral and religious feeling expires, the domestic affections are destroyed, all regard for law or property is lost, and hope is quenched in desperate wretchedness: so that at last, owing to these withering causes, families have been found, even in London, huddling together like animals, the very instincts of humanity obliterated, and, like the brutes, relieving every want, and gratifying every passion in the full view of the community.

These are the reasons why the districts of filth are not only the districts of fever, scrofula, consumption, and cholera, but also of crime. Habits are early formed of idleness and dishonesty—of brutality, inexpressible profligacy, and sensual indulgence; and here are educated those irreclaimable malefactors, the constitution of whose minds is a constant grief and, indeed, enigma. Their wickedness we are prepared for, but we are not prepared for their callous insensibility to all the ordinary motives which influence human beings, for their unaccountable and uncontrollable irritability, for their recklessness akin to that of a wild beast, and for that distorted intellectual acuteness resembling more the dull cunning of a madman than the reason of a man.

The numerous deaths of an unhealthy district have a bad moral effect. They harden the heart. The expense, trouble, and anxiety arising from a sickly family often make the wretched parents regard their offspring as a burden, and their death as a happy release from a miserable existence. But it is not with impunity that the natural affections are destroyed. The transition from this state of mind to that which looks upon children's burial clubs as a source of profit, is too often found an easy one.

It has been said that an excessive rate of mortality is one of the appointed means by which evils work out their own cure, and an over-numerous population is thinned. With a Christian philanthropist this argument, even if true, would have no weight. But it is more to our present purpose to remark that it has no foundation in fact. An extreme mortality, caused by the mor-

bific influences arising from the want of cleanliness, has hardly any effect in decreasing the numbers of the population ; it only renders them weak and wretched. The worse their condition, the earlier they marry. These influences do not diminish fecundity ; there is reason to suspect they increase it : and it is beyond a doubt that the greater the mortality among children, the more numerous are the births. Grown-up men and women are replaced by the more youthful ; and this rapid substitution of the young and helpless for adults is doubly injurious : it diminishes the productive power of the country, while it accelerates the increase of the population. It entails a frightful expenditure, besides being a social calamity, and, as far as it is preventible, a national sin.

The expense of doctors' bills to the poor is far greater than is supposed. Many a workman receiving 20s. a-week pays, not only proportionably, but actually, more for medicine than a gentleman with 1000*l.* a-year. The cases of families brought on the parish by preventible sickness are innumerable. The sickness of a scrofulous child will cost from 4*l.* to 10*l.* ; its burial 2*l.* to 4*l.* A confinement costs 4*l.* or 5*l.* ; and numerous as these are, the miscarriages are still more numerous. We had selected, but are compelled to omit, the detailed cases of individuals who, though receiving regular wages of 20s. and 25s. a-week, became utter paupers solely from the expense of confinements, miscarriages, medicines, and undertakers' bills. Dr. Toynbee visited one hundred families, and found 212 of the members actually suffering from disease ; there had been 251 deaths and funerals, and a corresponding amount of sickness ; 350 members of these 100 families were dependent children, whose average age was little more than ten years. It is terrible to contemplate the amount of social misery caused, and the expense entailed upon the public, by the removal of *heads* of families from such a community as this. A little saving in sickness would pay a heavy water-rate. The comparison is not the less certain because the actual result cannot be stated in figures. Sickness and pauperism are inseparable, and the parish, in the long run, must pay for the sick labourer's rent, food, clothing, for medical attendance on him during his life, for his funeral at his death, and for the support of his wife and family after he is dead. To give some idea of the money cost of our present system, by which the preventible disease of fever is perpetuated, we may mention that the *extra* expense from *fever cases* in the Bethnal Green and Whitechapel Unions was at the rate of 2467*l.* a year. In 1843 the London Fever Hospital received 500 fever cases in four months, and, during a considerable

portion of the time, thirty or forty applications a-day were refused, from want of room. When an inquiry was made by twenty metropolitan unions to ascertain what proportion of those receiving parochial relief were suffering from fever, it was found in the district of St. George's, Southwark, that out of 1467 persons receiving parochial relief, 1276 were ill with fever. After the cholera appeared last summer, Peahen Court, a little court off Bishopsgate Street, had sent to the parish of St. Ethelburga by the 29th of August, one cholera widow and twelve cholera orphans. It was calculated that they would cost the parish 420*l.*, and that the court might have been put in order, and probably all sickness prevented, for 30*l.* But, not to weary our readers, we will only refer to the official statement of the proportion of deaths from cholera in the thirteen weeks ending the 15th Sept. 1849. Since Cholera is in truth a health inspector, who speaks through his interpreter, the Registrar-General, in a language which reaches all ears, and points out with terrible distinctness and unfailing accuracy those districts which are not only occasionally the regions of death, but at all times the nurseries of disease.

PARISHES.				Proportion of Deaths from Cholera to every 10,000 of the Population.
Country District -	Hampstead	-	-	8
London north of the Thames :	St. James's, Westminster	-	-	12
	Marylebone	-	-	15
	Holborn	-	-	28
	Shoreditch	-	-	65
	Bethnal Green	-	-	75
London south of the Thames :	Lambeth	-	-	97
	St. Saviour	-	-	141
	St. George	-	-	142
	St. Olave	-	-	151
	Bermondsey	-	-	163
	Rotherhithe	-	-	225

Now compare the extremes, Hampstead and Rotherhithe. At the latter, out of 225 persons, 217 have died from preventible causes; there are 28 times the number of deaths that there are at Hampstead, 28 times the cases of sickness, 28 times the number and cost of funerals, 28 times the doctors' bills, and 28 times as many widows and helpless children to be supported by somebody. We must also remember that this is not the



case of an epidemic scourging one locality and sparing another, but the index of what is going on at all times, and will continue to go on till the end of time, unless, by an abundant supply of water, we wash away the causes of those diseases which are silently but incessantly wasting away the health, the morals, and the wealth of the community.

Eminent physicians declare that the existing amount of sickness and mortality may be reduced one half; and to show that this is no vague exaggeration, we will quote the case of Windmill Court, in Rosemary Lane, described by Mr. Liddle, the medical officer of the Whitechapel union. It was dirty, undrained, and ill-supplied with water: he had to visit it two or three times a day for fever cases, and in seven months attended forty-one new cases of sickness in that one court. It was afterwards flagged, drained, and supplied with water; and Mr. Liddle tells the result. 'In the last four or five months I have 'had but two cases;' and the rents were so much better paid that the landlord was thought to have *profited* by the improvements, which he had executed at his own expense. A current of water had in fact swept away nineteen twentieths of the sickness. This is fully corroborated by the experience of Harebrain Court, Cooper's Court, and other places. In Nottingham, in 1832, there were 1100 cases of cholera, of which 289 were fatal. After the disease had passed off, the town was supplied with water, and other sanitary measures adopted with such effect that when, in 1849, the cholera appeared a second time, there were only eight cases, of which six were fatal. And it appears that between the healthy and unhealthy districts of that town there is a difference of sixty per cent. in the average duration of human life. So that when we hear complaints of the quality of the water in London, and agree that it would be well to have a jet seventy feet high instead of the dumb waiters in Trafalgar Square, to have a magnificent fountain in the Temple, and cascades in the royal gardens, with abundance of water for cleansing the streets and extinguishing fires, we contend that,—although the water companies should accomplish all this to-morrow—the great and crying evil of the present system would, notwithstanding, be in no way lessened. It is not the convenience of the rich, but the necessities of the poor, that call upon us for instant legislation, under penalties so heavy and responsibilities so awful. The richer classes are in some degree able to protect themselves; but the masses, the millions who live by the sweat of their brow, these men are helpless. Whatever else we do, we do nothing, unless we give them plenty of water for the purposes of cleanliness. This is the main object; and we trust and believe that all

interests which stand as obstacles in the way will be made to bend or break. To those who watch with admiration, mingled with awe, the growth of the immense influence of the daily press, the course generally taken by it on sanitary and economical questions affecting the interests of the poor, is a source of unfeigned satisfaction and thankfulness, as well as a pledge of success. It is to the honour and safety of the nation, when journals like 'The Times' and 'Morning Chronicle,' and 'Daily News,' at once the exponents and guides of public opinion, in their several quarters, take up these questions, and advocate the cause of the poor with sound good sense and infinite perseverance, research, and talent.

It may be asked, is this object attainable? Is it *possible* to obtain anywhere a daily supply of sixty or a hundred millions of gallons of pure water? The answer involves a consideration of the topographical and geological position of London.

London is situated upon the lower tertiary or eocene formation; the upper stratum is a tenacious clay, the next is designated plastic clay, and is composed of argillaceous deposit and beds of sand; these rest upon the chalk, a formation from 300 to 500 feet in thickness, not lying horizontally, but rising up all round like the sides of a basin, and coming to the surface at the Surrey and Chiltern hills. The water which falls upon and percolates through the edges of the porous chalk, is arrested at the bottom of the basin by a layer of gault or impermeable clay, and accumulates there until the whole stratum becomes charged with water; and the rim of the chalk basin being higher than the strata which it contains, the water, whenever the opportunity is given by a sufficiently deep well or hole, has a tendency, from the hydrostatic pressure, to rise through the superincumbent beds to its natural level above the surface of the ground. The wells are of three classes: the first are shallow, and furnish an absolutely poisonous water, impregnated with the leakage from gas pipes, the soakage from cesspools, and the drainage from graveyards; the second reach the sandy water-bearing beds of the plastic clay, and generally produce water full of ferruginous and other impurities, and sometimes contaminated by the deep cesspools; the third class are sunk into the chalk, and supply clear and good, though hard, water.

It was once imagined that an inexhaustible supply might be obtained from the wells in the chalk; but that idea is now exploded,—or nearly so; we make the reservation out of respect to Mr. Taberner, — the increased number of deep wells having already diminished the quantity in the subterraneous reservoir. Each new well lowers the level of the water in its neighbour: in

one brewer's well the water level has fallen ninety-three feet; Calvert & Co., and Barclay & Co., have restricted themselves to the use of their wells on alternate days; the Artesian wells at Brentford, at the Horticultural Gardens, and at the Bishop of London's gardens at Fulham, no longer overflow; the well constructed by the New River Company, near the New Road, is a failure; at the Pentonville Prison the average water-level has sunk twelve feet in seven years; and on the whole it seems that the water-level in the deep wells of London has been sinking for the last twenty-five years at the rate of two feet per annum. A project was started in 1840, and has been again revived, of obtaining a supply from wells in the chalk district near Watford; but the engineer at that time recommended farther inquiry, and the amount sought to be obtained is totally inadequate to the purposes now under consideration.

We are therefore compelled to turn our minds from water under the surface to the upper or river drainage—that is, to the Thames, or some of its affluents. Objections have been raised against river water, because every river receives a certain amount of urban and agricultural drainage. This is true; but we cannot go to 'the seven wells' at Cheltenham; and at every successive mile of its course the Thames receives some description of drainage. To supply London with perfectly pure water is, apparently, an impossibility. Purity then becomes a question of degree. The first requisite is a very large supply; the second, that it shall be as pure as circumstances will admit. We therefore reject the Lea and the Brent because they receive a very unusual amount of drainage; the Colne for the same reason and on account of its paper mills, which pollute water more than any other manufacture; the Wey on engineering grounds; the Wandle, Verulam, and similar minor tributaries, as being insufficient; and the Thames itself, below Maidenhead, because, emerging from the hills, it there enters into the rich basin of the London clay, and receives the drainage of the innumerable hamlets, villages, and towns which stud its banks. On the other hand the most fastidious have never sought to go beyond Oxford; and thus the discussion has practically been narrowed to one point—whether the supply should come from above or below Reading—from Mapledurham, or from Henley. Those who support the Mapledurham scheme do so on the ground that they avoid the drainage of Reading; the others argue that this objection may be removed, and, at all events, is more than compensated by the accession, below Mapledurham, of water from two tributaries, the Kennet and the Loddon, one fifty-three, the other twenty-four, miles long,—and both of very

unusual purity, in consequence of traversing thinly inhabited chalk districts, containing much down land, little cultivated, and chiefly appropriated to sheep farming. On the Kennet we believe there are only two or three mills by which the quality of the water can be affected. After heavy showers also, as there is little surface drainage in a chalk district, in which the rain sinks into the ground and is filtered before it breaks out in a stream, the Kennet remains almost as pure as before, while the Thames is *comparatively* turbid, having received a large amount of surface drainage from the Oxford clay. Whatever be the respective merits of these schemes, it cannot be denied that in this locality the Thames will afford a daily supply of 100,000,000 of gallons of water, sufficiently pure for all the ordinary purposes of life. Lucretius, in the passage beginning,

‘ pereunt imbres, ubi eos pater æther  
In gremium matris Terræ precipitavit :  
At nitidæ surgunt fruges, ramique virescunt  
Arboribus ;’

describes, in his exquisite language, the showers perishing as they sink into the earth, and yet becoming the origin of the green foliage of the woods, and of the shining produce of the fields, the food of man and of beast. The rain that descends upon the Wiltshire downs may be made to minister to a higher end, if we compel it to rise again amidst the tenements of the London workmen, and contribute to their health, their happiness, and their morals.

It is of importance, also, to observe that in no direction can London be approached by an aqueduct so easily as from the direction of Maidenhead. The unexampled facilities afforded by the level valley of the Thames have been taken advantage of for the construction of canals and railways; and the promoters of the Henley on Thames project assert that, if an aqueduct was carried westward from Paddington, without aiming at any objects but cheapness of construction and a suitable inclination for the current of water, it would strike the Thames at Henley Reach. Whether this be the case or not, it is clearly desirable that the main reservoir of London should be as high as possible above the town, provided it be not higher than the average level of the ground along which the aqueduct is to pass, and that the water should flow into it by the force of gravitation alone, without requiring to be elevated by mechanical means, or checked in its current by locks. Should the main reservoir not command the whole of London, it will be cheaper to form an additional reservoir at the required height, and pump water

into it, than to bring in the whole quantity at the maximum elevation.

It cannot be disputed that, if we divert perhaps one third of the Thames at Reading in order to pour it through the sewers of London, we shall affect the corn and paper mills on the river. But this water power, once of great consequence, as being the only mechanical power in the vicinity of London, is yet subject to interruption from floods, frosts, and droughts, and is daily falling in value before the steadiness and certainty of steam power; and the cost of substituting steam for water power to every mill between London and Reading would not amount to any sum worth noticing. The preservation of the navigation is more serious. But whatever may be its importance, we do not hesitate to say that it sinks into insignificance before the other interests involved in this question. We are bound to look the difficulty in the face, and to carefully consider every suggestion, which holds out a prospect of removing it; but if no means can be found, perfectly adequate or perfectly unobjectionable, let us not shrink from a decision. On one side is our money, on the other our life; here is our commerce, there is our happiness. Is water given to us primarily to be a medium of traffic, or because it is a necessary of existence? Shall we use the railway and pay a shilling or two per ton extra, or shall we keep to the river and have an extra pestilence every fifteen years? Shall we empty our barges, or shall we fill our churchyards?

But the report of Messrs. Walker and Leach, the engineers of the Thames Navigation Committee, demonstrates that the difficulty is very far from insurmountable. The Thames, in that part of its course, flows in *reaches*: the depth of a river depends not alone upon the volume of water, but on the rapidity of the current, and the inclination of its surface; and the same skill which has carried canals over the most irregular and broken countries may, by locks and dams judiciously placed, not only maintain, but improve the navigation of the Thames, and that, too, without any inordinate expense.

The English, more than any nation of ancient or modern times, have adhered to the rule of carrying on their great undertakings upon the principle of trade, trusting to the boundless energy of private enterprise. Our lighthouses, our national bank, and our Indian empire, show the singular power and flexibility of this principle; but they also show the circumstances in which it fails, and by which the mere trading company is converted virtually into a department of the Government. Whenever a government has attempted to direct commercial enterprise and enter into a fair competition for its

rewards, it has failed. On the other hand, whenever competition has been destroyed, and a practical monopoly established, the quickening impulse of the commercial principle seems to die away, and, in one form or other, Government control takes its place. There can be no competition in lighting the seas; and, lighthouses having in fact ceased to be private speculations, the Trinity Board is virtually under the control of the Government. The Bank of England only retains its exclusive privileges because it acknowledges its duties to the public to be paramount even to the interests of its shareholders, and by a judicious deference to the wishes of the Executive. The trade with India has passed into private hands, and the empire which our merchants won is ruled by a responsible minister. Wherever the principle of trade fails or ends in a monopoly, or wherever the discharge of a public duty is superadded to and supersedes the pursuit of private profit, the English people will trust none but a responsible body. A tendency to combination, in order to extinguish competition, is inseparable from that class of enterprises in which the amount of receipts is measured by the requirements of a specific locality, and where a large capital is necessarily sunk irrecoverably in the first instance. Competition between coaches, where the primary outlay is but small, may arise and die, and arise again perpetually; but between water companies, gas companies, or railways, whatever turns the scale at all will turn the whole trade. So that the struggle is for life or death, and no sacrifice is too great to crush a rival utterly. The consequence is, as Mr. Stephenson tersely expressed it, where combination is possible, competition is impossible.

Water companies show as clearly as any other instance the truth of this maxim. There never was a fairer area or greater scope for competition than the city of London, — the largest, the most populous, the most luxurious, and the wealthiest city in the world, and familiarised, by the bent of the national mind, to the encouragement of joint enterprise. Up to the beginning of the present century there was no competition; but when the East London, the West Middlesex, and the Grand Junction Companies arose in 1810, so violent a struggle ensued, that in four years all the companies were on the verge of ruin. In 1815 and 1817 they coalesced and partitioned the metropolis north of the Thames among them: since that date there has been no competition whatsoever; and we are never likely to see it again. The companies south of the Thames were under certain restrictions until 1834; but when these were removed, a competition broke out, which raged in full force from 1839 to 1842, and then died its natural death by combination. This contest

stands pre-eminent in ruinous absurdity. There were in some streets three distinct sets of pipes, with separate sets of persons to attend to each. Capricious customers were constantly changing from one to the other, and the pavement was torn up daily. The plumber's bills for removing the pipes from one main to another were of course enormous. So sharp was the practice, that sometimes the pipes were put to the wrong main, and one company sent in the bill for water which its opponent had unconsciously supplied. The Vauxhall Company spent in one street 2400*l.* in pipes, and had in return the barren satisfaction of drawing from the Southwark Company tenants to the extent of 81*l.* The directors abused each other on paper, and the workmen actually fought in the streets. The famous war between Modena and Bologna, on account of the 'rape of the bucket,' was renewed in Southwark; and had the imaginative Tassoni lived in our days, he would have called to the inhabitants

' Vedrai, s' al cantar mio porgi l'orecchia,  
Elena trasformarsi in una Secchia.'

But no one good,—not even a good poem, as in the tuneful land of Italy,—resulted from this competition. The object of the companies was not to improve the water supply, but to ruin each other; the struggle was to get the custom of the rich,—none of them cared for the poor. The districts which were supposed likely to yield a good return had treble sets of pipes, and their streets perpetually broken up and rendered impassable; while others were left without water for domestic purposes and protection from fire. Water drawn from near Waterloo Bridge was supplied without even being filtered, although the sum annually expended in *useless* plumbing, paving, and canvassing, would have been more than sufficient for all that was wanted. While the companies under this process of mutual attrition were fast grinding their capital away, the sum paid by the public in water rents would have produced a dividend of *ten per cent.* upon the capital really requisite to provide them with an abundant supply of water. On both banks of the Thames, the coalition of the companies was followed by an augmentation of the water rates, beginning with 25 per cent. additional, and an extra charge for high service. The revenue has of course been enlarged in proportion; between 1821 and 1828 it increased, on the north side of the Thames alone, 44,000*l.* a year: in twenty years the total water rents have risen from 162,000*l.* to 370,000*l.* per annum.

Though competition, under these circumstances, does no good

to any one, the risk of competition, however remote, has a real effect in maintaining a costly and inefficient system. True economy in the distribution of water is obtained by a large outlay at first; but the possibility of losing the first outlay altogether, leads trading companies to reverse this principle, to save the first cost which falls upon them, and to swell the current charges which are paid by the public. The laying on of water to a fourth class house in London costs individuals about 4*l*. Neither the water company, the builder, nor the tenant will risk this first outlay, and consequently too often nothing is done; though all agree that if the first expense was borne by a public fund, and repaid with interest by a rate upon the property, the improvement would be readily adopted. Such economy is there in good *primary* general arrangements, that in Nottingham this same sum of 4*l*. per house has been found sufficient for all the outlay necessary to pump water from the Trent, to filter it, to convey it to the town, and to distribute it, at constant high pressure and in unlimited quantity, to every habitation.

The various improvements adopted by the water companies so far from arising from the principle of trade, are due solely to a threat of its being abandoned. The augmentation of rates consequent on the unholy alliance of 1817, produced a storm, which eventually burst in 1821, in the form of a Parliamentary inquiry, and taught the companies the danger of stimulating the public to seek an effectual remedy. Again, in 1828, a cry was raised against the quality of the water. Unhappily, in the conduct of this accusation the amount of truth contained in it was overlaid by great exaggerations; besides which, the Committee to whom the inquiry was entrusted, was not very judiciously handled, and symptoms of jobbing and favouritism appeared. The companies were not slow in availing themselves of the advantages thus placed in their hands: they exposed the errors of their adversaries; they brought up chemists and engineers, whose clear, cool evidence told well against the angry misrepresentations of their accusers. The Committee lost weight, — the Government refused to interfere, — and finally the companies, thankful at having weathered the gale, vowed amendment: some resorted to a purer source of supply, and others promised settling reservoirs and filtering beds. The cholera of 1832 produced in 1834 another Committee, but with no particular result. A scheme proposed by Mr. Telford broke down at once, not without some discredit to the author. Another Committee, in 1840, proved equally useless. While the public was relying on the expression of public opinion, and the effect



of competition, the companies had ceased to care for either, knowing that the only real remedy had not yet been thought of. They out-argued their opponents, puzzled the Committee, and left them to waste their time in investigating a variety of empirical projects. The Committee separated without reporting; and with this impotent conclusion ended the last effort at legislative interference,—leaving London in the hands of a water confederation. No man has redress against increased rates; no man can enforce attention to his complaints; and no man, we suppose, is rash enough to dream of actual resistance to an antagonist who can ‘cut off his water supply.’

We say that the principle of trade is not applicable to the supply of water to the metropolis, not only because it produces an irresponsible practical monopoly, but because it is necessarily inadequate to the purpose. It is admitted that water rents cannot be collected from weekly tenants. For the companies to retail this necessary of life to the very poor, does not *pay*; though it would pay if the first cost was charged on the property, and the interest and current expenses included in the rent paid to the landlord. The companies therefore leave them unsupplied. We do not blame them for this,—it could not, and never will be, otherwise. But the mere fact, that a vast number of houses in London have no water supplied to them, (the Report of the Health of London Association in 1847 puts the number at 70,000: in the New River district the number of persons unsupplied was stated by the Health of Towns Commissioners to be 300,000,) is a positive proof that this principle does not accomplish what we require.

Mr. Babbage remarked, with great truth, how difficult it was for people to contend with monopolists who have tact enough to make some slight concessions when the public wrath begins to rise above ‘the growling point.’ Since 1817, the water companies have raised their rates and their dividends, and enormously augmented their revenues,—they have outlived two pestilences,—they have been subjected to four formal inquiries, in two of which the public mind was violently excited, and have come out of the ordeal stronger than before. Against the assaults of internal competition and external interference, they have been triumphantly successful. In this success lies, we think, the germ of their annihilation. On two points the public mind is in the course of being slowly made up; and the conclusion will be maintained all the more firmly, because it is formed against the national instincts. One is, that the principle of trade, applied under the most favourable circumstances, has failed to supply London with water as it ought to be supplied, and has failed most

where most required, viz. in the poor and densely populated districts. The other is, that it is in vain to hope for anything better for the future from the companies themselves, through any pressure, legislative or other, which can be brought to bear against them. The conclusion is inevitable,—a different principle must be adopted: if there must be a monopoly, and no doubt there must, let it be placed in the hands of the Government, or some public body responsible to the consumers.

The constitution of such a body deserves careful consideration. Its duties must extend to the drains of London. It is not at first an unnatural idea that the supply of water *to* a house and its removal *from* it, are such different services that they might be entrusted to different functionaries. But the mains and the sewers are merely vehicles for the moving power of the water, and all three are parts of one system and require the nicest adjustment to each other. Besides, the house drainage is considered to be three times as important as the sewer or street drainage, and is inseparably connected with the distribution of water—so that a line cannot be drawn anywhere with advantage; for whoever is answerable for the main sewers ought to have jurisdiction over the house drains, the pipes communicating with the mains, and the mains themselves up to the reservoir. If a distinction must be made somewhere, it ought to be at the discharging orifice of the reservoir; but we would prefer to concentrate responsibility on a single body, and that when complaints are made, the public should not be shuffled from one Board to another,—from those who distribute the water to those who merely convey it to London.

It would appear that as the funds for these purposes will be provided by the rate-payers, and the services of the Board chiefly devoted to supplying the wants of rate-payers, so the nomination of its members should proceed from them also. But we dread a Board whose members should have owed their election to their political bias or to their activity in canvassing; and when we see the working of parochial elections, and how often private interest and political combinations interfere with the public benefit, and how slight is the real responsibility of the elected, we believe that the great body of rate-payers, who after all would probably take no share in the choice, would be better pleased to devolve the responsibility of selection upon the Government. But it is a question for the inhabitants of London to decide: our only desire is to have a body with elevated views and amenable to public opinion.

We must say a few words as to expense; and we purposely avoid estimates, because there are broad facts stronger than any

estimates. The water rents paid in London amount to 370,000*l.* a year, and allowing 44 per cent. for current expenses, we have a net revenue of 200,000*l.* a year, which would raise and finally extinguish an outlay of 4,000,000*l.* The citizens defray also the expense of communication pipes, cisterns, &c. equal, as the engineers tell us, to the whole capital of the water companies; that is to say, as much capital is expended by the inhabitants in bringing water on the intermittent principle from the street to the house, as by the water companies in bringing it from the river to the street. We will, however, not call this more than one million. The repairs of these pipes are very expensive, two thirds of the labour being actually consumed in *useless* journeys, besides the waste from inexperienced workmen and bad work. Mr. Hawksley says that one half of this expense would be saved by the system of constant supply; and that in Nottingham, on the principle of constant pressure, one man and a boy can attend to 8000 houses, and keep all the works of distribution in perfect repair. Then there is the cost of removal of filth calculated at 20*s.* per house annually, and London contains 300,000 houses; so that the sum actually paid away every year in London represents a capital of at least *seven millions*; and this, without charging anything for fire insurance and sickness, the expense of which latter item should be reckoned in millions rather than thousands.

When we come to compare one city with another, we see at once that the cost per house of distribution will be greater in a large city than in a small one, but the first cost of an aqueduct will be smaller. There is no city in the world on which the cost of an aqueduct would fall so lightly as on London, in consequence of its immense size and its position in a level valley. Taking the scale of outlay for all purposes, from the experience of Nottingham, 4*l.* a house, it will give 1,200,000*l.* If we make full allowance and double that sum, we shall still only reach an amount represented by one third of our present annual expenditure. With the example of a small town such as Greenock or Nottingham, of larger towns such as Glasgow and New York, and with such a wide margin for error, we want no nice estimates to add force to our assertion, that an unlimited amount of water might be poured into London for less money than it now pays for a limited and bad supply, and that the most extravagant proceeding just now would be — to do nothing.

Some apprehension has been caused by the idea that the water companies would claim enormous sums as compensation.

Compensation for what?

We entirely disagree with those who seek to raise a clamour against the water companies. We should be glad to find that

after all they have not broken their promises, have not given us bad water, have not augmented the rates, have not neglected the poor, and that the calculations which prove their dividends bad, deserve the praise of honesty rather than ingenuity. Even if disappointed in this, we would not be over zealous in blaming men for having human infirmities, but conclude that these trading companies have only followed the law of their creation. On the whole, perhaps, the inhabitants of London have been served better than they had any right to anticipate. If praise or blame is to be administered, we think the praise should be given to the companies for not having given 'another turn to the screw,' and the blame to those whose short-sighted incapacity led them to trust the screw into any hands but their own. But this is a matter, not of praise or blame, but of money; nor to be determined on philanthropical or ethical, but on commercial principles. The agreement between the companies and the public is of the simplest character, beyond the wit of man to mystify. On the one hand, the companies proposed to risk their capital in the hope and on the chance that they would obtain remunerative dividends. On the other, the public were ready to submit their convenience, even their necessities, to the pleasure of an irresponsible body, to pay a large extra sum annually in the shape of profits to the trader, and all simply to keep their hands unfettered, and *not* to risk their capital. The existence of half these companies demonstrates that no one has a vested interest in the right of supplying water to London or any part of it. Sir W. Clay, chairman of three of the companies, says, quite fairly, 'to private parties the supply of water is a commercial enterprise: they have a right to look for rates which will not only pay current interest on the capital expended, but *as much larger a return as will be a compensation for the risk incurred.*' Precisely so: but to repudiate the risks — one of them being this very chance of keeping up a virtual monopoly — and in the same breath claim it as the foundation of vested rights, could have occurred only to the London water companies,

'Those pagod things of sceptred sway,  
With fronts of Brass, and feet of Clay.'

Who offered to risk their money? The water companies. Who received the dividends? The water companies. Who claim the profits? The water companies. Who is to bear the losses? The public will, — if they pay compensation on resumption.

There is no class in the community but has a deep interest in the proper settlement of this water question. To the tradesman it comes directly home as a matter of business. When an epidemic breaks out, the wealthy escape to healthier localities: few Londoners will dispute that 1849 was a bad season, and that

little money comes across the counter when the Registrar General returns three thousand deaths a week. Landlords are affected by the non-payment of their rents. It is an axiom among builders that rent is best got from healthy houses, and all agree that the poor pay as honestly as any other class, so long as they have the means. Mr. Little, a builder, says that three fifths of his losses of rent from his tenants, who are working men, are caused by sickness — principally fevers and those debilitating illnesses which, arising from want of cleanliness, and bad drainage, fall under the head of preventible. It might be thought that the landlord's interest would of itself lead him to remedy this; but there are often divided interests, which do not and cannot act simultaneously, and the profit would be divided among many, while the first outlay would be borne by one. In these cases the difficulty can be removed by the law alone. No house should be allowed to be inhabited unless it be provided with the appliances of cleanliness. No man has a right to erect a nuisance: and the public has clearly as good a right and as great an interest in enforcing cleanliness to prevent the outburst of an epidemic, as in requiring party walls to prevent the spread of fire; to forbid the sale of putrid water, as well as of putrid meat. The first cost of what is necessary for the public health should be borne by the public, and the amount replaced by an annual rate upon the property.

Whatever increases the necessary expenditure of the workman increases by so much the cost of the produce of his labour, and is therefore a tax upon the consumer, whatever his position in life; besides which, the richer classes are often affected by circumstances from which they fancy themselves exempt. Albion Terrace, in the Wandsworth Road, consists of seventeen houses, and is occupied by persons in easy circumstances. Last August the spring from which they obtained water became contaminated with the leakage from a cesspool, and produced a disease which in a short time destroyed forty or fifty people in that one terrace. And the same thing may happen to any spring in London, such is the state of the subsoil. At Battersea, the spring used by a baker was poisoned in the same way, and for a long time the deleterious mixture was kneaded up in the dough, and sent round to his customers. Shocking as these things are, they are part of the great law which binds the rich and the poor together. It is well for us that our natural selfishness, hardened by the self-indulgence of wealth, should, at times, be rudely shaken, and aroused by our fears, if not by our sense of duty, — that we should be reminded that our destinies are inextricably mingled with those of the poorest and most degraded of our fellow countrymen, — that we have, after all, a common

humanity; and that property,—which all consider the main, and some the sole end of society,—has its duties, as well as its rights.

None are free from this law. The statesman, in the pride of conscious power, while by the magic of his words he bends the assembled Commons to his will, is the prey of an influence subtler than his own. When the strong excitement of the hour has passed away, the unstrung nerves, the feverish pulse, the throbbing head, may warn him, when it is too late, that a heavy vapour from the pestilential courts of Westminster had glided into the presence of the rulers of the land, and had been busy at its appointed work. Even in that rich and glorious chamber where the Queen meets the Peers of England, and where the genius of Barry, prodigal of decoration, has exhausted art in combining all that can enchant the eye and intoxicate the imagination, even there, some spectator more inquisitive and thoughtful than the rest, may have learned that under that very building passes a huge sewer, which is fast becoming an enormous cesspool, and in whose capacious recesses are fermenting the deadly gases, which, when encountered in their intensity\*, kill with the suddenness of a stroke of lightning, but which more ordinarily float in the atmosphere, visiting the palace as well as the cottage, and bearing the seeds of disease upon their wings. It was a wisdom beyond man's wisdom which bade us remember that we have the poor always with us. The labouring classes ought to be the stay and strength of our country,—but neglect, though it will not dissolve the connexion which fastens the upper to the lower ranks of society, and is indeed a union for better for worse, may make our fate that which was inflicted by Mezentius, and link us to a festering mass of rottenness and corruption.

But there are higher principles of action than our riches or our health. We have already said, that this is quite as much a question of public morals. An eye-witness, speaking in September, 1849, says that in Bermondsey there is an open sewer into which all the house drains go. Houses are built over it, and it receives all the filth from them: the liquid puddle is of the colour of strong green tea. And this is what the inhabitants *drink!* Unable at first to credit the evidence of his senses, he questioned the people. They said 'they were obliged to drink the ditch without they could beg or thieve a pailful of water;' and a wretched mother added, 'neither I nor my children know what health is; but what can we do,—we must live where our bread is.' We would seriously ask how much longer these things are to go on in a Christian city? and what greater proof we need

---

\* This was the case of the Pimlico sewer.

of the insufficiency of the principle of trade? Can we wonder that these people fly to the pothouse to quench their thirst? that, when they are thus led into temptation, intemperance works their degradation and becomes their curse? or that they have small respect for the legislation which is blind to the wants of the poor, but Argus-eyed to protect the speculations of the rich? If it were the will of Providence that Bermondsey should be fourteen times as unhealthy and miserable as St. James's, we should bow to the decrees of Omnipotence. But if it arises from the ways of man, shall we suit our words to our actions, and say, 'The rated annual value of London is ten millions — property is a sacred thing—we dare not trust it to the principle of trade—Government must interfere, and we will gladly pay the police-rate. But life is quite another matter; Governments are sadly given to jobbing,—we pay enough in rates already; the principle of trade is good enough here — every man for himself; there is plenty of water for those who are able to buy it—let poor people drink at the sewers—who cares whether they live or die?'

What has been done by other towns may be done by London. At Aberdeen the water supply is managed most satisfactorily by a public body, the Police Commissioners. The constant pressure system has been adopted with infinite advantage by Preston, Nottingham, Greenock, Paisley, Ayr, Glasgow, Tavi-stock, Bristol, Newcastle, Philadelphia, and New York. The Thames gives an abundant supply; and an aqueduct thirty miles long is a trifling work compared to a railway. At Nottingham 5000 poor tenements are supplied with an unlimited quantity of filtered water in every house for a penny per week each, and this leaves a profit to the parties furnishing the supply. Whatever, too, is done now, should be done effectually, for nothing is so expensive as to do work twice over;—and the rapidity at which London is increasing is prodigious. It appears by a return laid before Parliament by the Commissioners of Police, that in the metropolitan district, in the ten years ending 1st January, 1849, there were built 64,058 new houses, making 200 miles of new streets, and that the increase of population was 325,904 persons. For five centuries London has been outgrowing its supply of water, and its annual augmentations are now far greater than ever. If we would legislate usefully for the future, we must not overlook the experience of the past. London may yet contain four millions of inhabitants, so that a cramped scheme must be a bad one; *magnitude* is a main element of success.

The shameful condition of our great capital in this respect is now fully before the public; and the credit of England is, we

think, involved in the course which we shall at last deliberately take. Whatever our provincial cities may do, it will be disgraceful to the nation if in our very metropolis we are surpassed in the arrangements for securing health and common decency, not only by the young republics of the New World, but even by the ancient empires of the Old. We boast of our wealth, our freedom, our science, our powers of combined exertion, our sense of comfort, and our love of cleanliness; we glory in our civilisation, but our glory becomes our shame, if still we are last in the race of humanity. The city of New York has expended 2,500,000*l.* on the Croton Water Works. An aqueduct forty miles long, and carried over the most formidable engineering difficulties, brings a daily supply of sixty millions of gallons for 400,000 inhabitants. This is an exertion of which our Transatlantic brethren may well be proud; it is a great work, and in a good cause, and we honour them for it. To form a just conception of it, we must consider the probability of the citizens of London, under a system of universal suffrage, taxing themselves to the extent of twelve millions and a half of our money in order to command a daily supply of 300 millions of gallons of water. Napoleon, the greatest administrative genius of modern times, proposed to supply Paris daily with 35 millions of gallons, brought by the Canal de l'Ourcq, from a distance of sixty miles. The scheme was postponed,—so that when the cholera appeared in 1832, a thousand persons sometimes perished in a single day; until the Parisian commissioners said, that in boundless terror and despair, the inhabitants fled precipitately from a city which they believed to be about to become their tomb. The capital of Eastern Europe has enormous cisterns; one of them, the reservoir of the 'thousand and one columns,' is calculated by Andreossi to be capable of holding a supply for Constantinople for sixty days. Carthage was supplied by an aqueduct forty miles long. Going farther back still, we find Solomon, the wisest of mankind, bearing testimony to the real duties of a government by building an aqueduct at Bethlehem to convey water from his *pools* or reservoirs to Jerusalem; and having thrown an arch or covering over his cistern, the Royal Poet draws a happy illustration from his own work, and (Cant. iv. 12.) compares his spouse to 'a garden inclosed, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed.'

But, beyond all other nations, the Roman people, that great race, the elevation of whose conceptions, and the granite firmness of whose character fitted them to become the masters of mankind,—and whose laws, whose combined and prolonged efforts, and lofty far-seeing policy seem rather the result of instinct than the slow product of human experience and observation,



recognised the importance of a due supply of water. Our difficulties, physical, social, and pecuniary, are as nothing compared to theirs: but the difference is still greater in our wills. We need not mention the sewers of their kings. Three hundred years before the Christian era the first aqueduct was made: before the republic ceased there were 800 baths in the city. After that, the emperors built those gigantic *thermæ* which are still the wonder of the world for their magnitude and scientific construction. The baths of Diocletian could accommodate 18,000 persons at once.

There is reason to believe that in Rome every house had its fountain: nor was a dwelling considered fit to receive a tenant, however poor, unless it was provided with a supply of water. Pliny, with natural triumph, asserts 'that if any person considered the abundance of water conveyed to the public for baths, fishponds, private houses, fountains, gardens, villas, over arches, through mountains, and across valleys filled up, he would acknowledge that nothing was ever more wonderful.' And well did the Roman energy justify this claim; for at one time the Imperial City contained 1300 reservoirs, into which the twenty mighty aqueducts that spanned the broad Campagna, poured a daily supply of fifty millions of cubic feet, or three hundred and twenty-five millions of gallons, of water.

It is vain to talk of freedom and civilisation, and vaunt of our Constitution as combining liberty with order, and sheltering our citizens alike from the bolts of autocratic tyranny and the storms of popular license, when we see our poor dying in pestilential courts; fighting in our streets, round a dribbling stand pipe, for the first element of cleanliness and health; or drinking, from the sewers of Bermondsey, worse than 'the gilded puddle which beasts would cough at:' and when we know that it would have been better for them if, we will not presume to say, they had never been born, but if they had been born the slaves of a Roman despot, or made good their way among a flight of emigrants to the munificent charity of New York.

Appius Claudius—who, about three hundred years before the Christian era, was censor and afterwards consul of Rome—was one of those remarkable men who impress on their age the stamp of their own minds. Greedy of power, and unscrupulous in the mode of acquiring it, he yet wielded it as became a statesman of the true Roman type. A fearless political reformer, he extended the franchise, and introduced into the Senate—until then a purely patrician assembly—a number of the sons of freedmen, hitherto despised by those haughty nobles as the sons of nobody. As clear-sighted in his administrative and sanitary, as he was bold in his political, measures,

he constructed the famous Appian Way from Rome to Capua, and the still more famous Appian Aqueduct, which brought water, from a distance of eight miles, for the poor citizens who had hitherto used the water of the Tiber, and inhabited the low district of the Circus,—the Bermondsey of Rome. It was said at the time that these undertakings exhausted the revenues of the city; but the statesman knew that in such works lie the secret springs of national wealth. The rising tide of prosperity soon replenished the treasury; and the unbounded ambition of Appius Claudius, though neither forgotten nor forgiven, will never be so favourably judged of, as when we read that by his exertions Rome was supplied with water, and when we find the historian, scorning our favourite principle of trade, emphatically calling upon his readers to remark that the first aqueduct of Rome was built for the benefit of the *poor*.

It may be fancy, but it seems to us that a cycle of above two thousand years has brought round, in Great Britain, a train of somewhat analogous circumstances. We, too, have seen the leaders of the people force their way to official power, extend the franchise, and invigorate our too patrician Legislative Assembly with a portion of the more popular element. More fortunate than the Roman consul, we have seen the reform withstand conservative reaction, and, like a breakwater, guard the edifice of our monarchy from the flood of anarchy and communism which deluged Europe and broke over the continental thrones. We have seen a network of five thousand miles of iron roads spread over our islands with an expenditure of labour, science, and money which makes even Roman roads seem but the playthings of children. These, too, are said to have exhausted our resources; but they are a storehouse of national wealth. We trust that some of our statesmen will complete the parallel; and that they who have won a name in history as political reformers, and struck the last fetters from our commercial system, will, like unto Appius Claudius except in his ambition, achieve the higher glory of bringing health and cleanliness to the dwellings of the poor.

This is the true glory which outlives all other, and shines with undying lustre from generation to generation,—imparting to its works something of its own immortality, and, in some degree, rescuing them from that ruin which overtakes the ordinary monuments of historical tradition or mere magnificence. The Tomb of Moses is unknown; but the traveller slakes his thirst at the Well of Jacob. The gorgeous palace of the wisest and wealthiest of monarchs, with its cedar, and gold, and ivory,—even the great Temple of Jerusalem, hallowed by the visible

glory of the Deity himself, — are gone; but Solomon's reservoirs are as perfect as ever. Of the ancient architecture of the Holy City not one stone is left upon another; but the Pool of Bethesda commands the pilgrim's reverence at the present day. The columns of Persepolis are mouldering into dust; but its cisterns and aqueducts remain to challenge our admiration. The Golden House of Nero is a mass of ruins; but the Aqua Claudia still pours into Rome its limpid stream. The Temple of the Sun at Tadmor in the wilderness, has fallen; but its fountain sparkles as freshly in his rays as when thousands of worshippers thronged the lofty colonnades. It may be that London will share the fate of Babylon, and nothing be left to mark its site save confused mounds of crumbling brickwork. But the works of Nature are imperishable. The Thames will continue to flow as it does now. And if any work of Art should still rise over the deep ocean of Time, we may well believe that it will be neither a palace nor a temple, but some vast aqueduct or reservoir: and if any name should still flash through the mist of antiquity, it will probably be that of the man who, in his day, sought the happiness of his fellow-men rather than their glory, and linked his memory to some great work of national utility and benevolence.

ART. IV.—1. *The Hellenics* of WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR, enlarged and completed. London: 1847.

2. *The Collected Works* of WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR. In two vols. medium 8vo. London: 1846.

3. *Poemata et Inscriptiones, novis auxit* SAVAGIUS LANDOR. London: 1847.

REMARKING, in a recent article, on the various schools of English poetry, we included Mr. Landor among those poets specially characterised by their devotion to ideal beauty and to classical associations. With classical literature his name has long been intimately joined, not only by many an 'Imaginary Conversation,' in which the heroes, poets, and philosophers of antiquity are evoked from the shades, but yet more by his poetry, formed as that has been, after a classical model, — his English poetry, not less than that written in the Latin language, of which he has been one of the latest as well as most successful cultivators. That model has its deficiencies as well as its excellencies. How great are the latter, is attested by the fact, that after the lapse of so many centuries, and the intervention of so many sources of interest, alien or adverse, we still

meet both scholars and men of original genius who seem never at home but when they breathe the air of antiquity.

In Mr. Landor's earlier dialogue between Southey and Porson, the latter is introduced expressing a preference for ancient above modern poetry. How far this statement indicates the opinions of the author we know not. We might be tempted to answer the question in the affirmative if we judged from a few strictures on Danté, which occur in Mr. Landor's 'Pentameron,' and which are written, as appears to us, with a keener appreciation of ancient poetry, than of the great bard so eloquently commented on. On the other hand, nowhere is a profounder admiration of Shakspeare evinced than in Mr. Landor's numerous works; and, assuredly, notwithstanding those lines, the tone of which, as one of our most discriminating critics, Mr. Leigh Hunt, has remarked, is thoroughly antique,—

‘You nymphs called naiads, of the wandering brooks,  
With your sedged crowns, and ever harmless looks,’

Shakspeare is far indeed from resembling an ancient poet. If Mr. Landor's opinion, however, was expressed in the passage referred to, it has apparently undergone no change from the publication of 'Gebir' to that of the 'Hellenics,' a book which cannot be better described than by saying that the name has not been ill-chosen. The subject of nearly all the poems it contains is supplied by Greece, and the treatment is in accordance with that subject. The following challenge is made good,—

‘I promise ye, as many as are here,  
Ye shall not, while ye tarry with me, taste  
From unrinsed barrel the diluted wine  
Of a low vineyard, or a plant ill-pruned,  
But such as anciently the Ægean isles  
Pour'd in libation at their solemn feasts.’

The Hellenics have all the clear outline, the definite grace, and the sunny expansiveness of Greek poetry, and not less its aversion to the mysterious and the spiritual. Above all they are classical in their peculiar mode of dealing with outward nature. We cannot better introduce them to our readers, than by a few remarks on the character of ancient literature in this respect.

The difference between ancient and modern poetry is in some measure analogous to that between the landscape of the South and of the North. Seen through air of gem-like purity, the former is characterised by its amplitude and its definiteness. A wider horizon embraces a nobler and larger field,—a field, notwithstanding, distinctly limited; for in that clear air the distant

mountain cuts the sky with a sharp and marked line. The landscape of the North is, on the contrary, seen as through a mist; but that mist harmonises the light and shade, freshens the near thicket with a more various colouring, and diffuses over the retiring distance a shadowy tenderness and pathos. In the former, the remote mountain looks like a hill, so clearly is every bush and rock revealed: in the latter, the hill hard by is robed in blue, and, from being placed at an imaginary distance, seems a mountain. The southern landscape is more beautiful to the senses, and lends itself more easily to Art: the northern makes a more touching appeal to the imagination, and lives more in the affections. When we say that the southern landscape lends itself easily to Art, we refer to the art of the painter, who in delineating its majestic and graceful outlines, and its colours, — mellow, and as it were seasoned, even in that resplendent light, — finds comparatively little which requires to be idealised.

How little the beautiful landscape of the South contributed to the kindred art of Poetry in ancient times, has been more than once remarked, but has not, so far as we remember, been adequately accounted for. And yet the circumstance could never have excited surprise if the true character of ancient poetry had been understood. That mountain scenery should have been distasteful to a Greek is a fact easily explained. Mountain scenery like that found in most parts of Greece is to none a matter of indifference. Like music, it is positively distasteful to those for whom it has not an attraction. Two characteristics of the Greek imagination indisposed it to such scenery, — its love of the orderly and the symmetrical, and its aversion to the unlimited and the terrible. There is an infinitude about mountain scenery, as about Gothic architecture. The broken precipice and abysmal gulf, — the ridges, line beyond line, pointing to and stretching after unattainable distances, — the rocks in their fall indicating unmeasured force, and where they lie arrested, eternal repose, — the labyrinthine defiles drawn out in endless perspective, — the chaos of cliff and peak in their wild harmony suggestive of a veiled design, — the valley convulsed in a moment, and the sabbath of the mountain top; these things, nay the very odours from forest depths, and the sighings of innumerable pines, include in them an element of the infinite. In such scenery the Greek imagination, possessing no key to its harmonies, saw nothing to delight it, but much to disquiet, to discompose, and to abash.

It is less easy to account for the fact that we find in Greek poetry but few allusions to the landscape of the plain. The Greeks were a loquacious race, and what they enjoyed they

ever celebrated ; and the truth is that there are not only countless species of beauty in Nature's ample domain, but many different modes of enjoying the same beauty. The Greeks, however, appear to have regarded Nature in a manner at once too sensuous and too imaginative for the appreciation of landscape. For the mere bodily eye landscape can hardly be said to exist : the separate objects that compose it appeal at once, and individually, to the sense ; but to combine those objects into a harmonious whole, to follow in thought the stream that flows past homestead, and tower, and town, to diffuse one's spirit over a wide tract, playing with the reeds in the foreground, reposing in relaxed enjoyment on the gradations of distance, and wistfully bending over the purple on the horizon,—in other words to enjoy the landscape as landscape,—is an endowment not of the sense but of a moral sentiment sustained by associations and affections. A much larger range and variety of feeling enter into modern life, and therefore into modern art :—Until some, while gazing on a landscape, can break out, with Cowper, — ‘ His are ‘ the valleys, and the mountains his, and the resplendent rivers ! ’ and, reconciled with Nature through knowledge of a common Creator, read in its countenance the hieroglyphic language of a spiritual world, and recognise in its perishable expanse the cradle, the home, and the grave of affections born for immortality. The Greek enjoyed Nature not less, but in an opposite manner. The very vividness with which each natural object, taken separately, thrilled through his delicate organisation, enkindling a child-like admiration and delight, must have proved an obstacle to that calm activity which combines object with object. His imagination also, as well as his sensibilities, acted after a fashion more impulsive and less reflective. It tarried with the object close by ; but, looking on it as on a marvel that needed interpretation, it crowned it with a legend.

Few things are more curious than the connexion between Pantheism, the philosophic basis of Greek religion, and that polytheistic worship, apparently its opposite, though in reality but a different stage of its developement. The Pantheist believed in no creative God existing independently of Nature. He believed in a Spirit diffused throughout all Nature, animating it and sharing its eternity. He looked upon Nature in a double aspect. Its perishable details he regarded with a lofty indulgence, or with an Epicurean sympathy ; but on its cyclical and self-renewing revolutions, on its rivers unexhausted while wave after wave disappeared, its forests, springing up again from the soil of their own dead leaves, its day re-issuing out of night, and life reborn from death,—on these

things he gazed with wonder and with reverence. The raging torrent or the fertilising stream seemed alike to him an attribute of the one pervading Spirit,—a function of the one diffused Life. A divinity not representing a prevailing Will, but a pervading Existence, and presented to the Mind rather than to the Moral Sense, was thus worshipped in the natural objects that symbolised its offices, as it might equally have been through images made by mortal hand. Such a theology will not long remain a religion in the higher sense of the term. It will not *bind* men, through a spiritual awe, to practical self-sacrifice. The balance between the sensuous and the supersensuous may by it be maintained as long, and only as long, as the moral sense retains a supreme place in the human heart. But in the downward tendency of natural instincts, the heart gradually surrenders its charge to the unsafe keeping of the imagination, a faculty prone to divinities, but less jealous in the vindication of their integrity than of its own liberty. The belief which Fancy simulates for its own contentment fills up, indeed, for a time, the place, and conceals the departure of that Faith to which the soul had once acknowledged a devout allegiance. The sense of religious obligation, however, once dissipated, the great central idea, that of the unity of the pervading Divinity, relaxes its grasp; and in the warm atmosphere of a pleasurable credulity, the seal melts from the testament of faith, the covenant of duty is abrogated, and the spiritual inheritance is forfeited. Powers which formerly were venerated as distinct but indivisible attributes of the one universal Divinity, require more and more, in proportion as their common internal support is removed, a sensible type, in order to be realised. Previously those Powers had, as it were, stood round the circle of existence, fixed and lifeless symbols: in a moment the centre to which they were attached ceases to exist; each now lives and moves; emblems become realities, and attributes rise into Gods.

At the same period that religion is superseded by art, priests are supplanted by poets. These poets are mythologists; and daily in their hand the worship which consecrates grove and stream acquires a more distinct articulation. Reverence for the supernatural having passed away, their function is to make relics of the memorials it has left behind, to bind into chaplets the flowers which Proserpine dropt in her flight, and to elevate Nature without transfiguring it. Marvellously did the Greek intelligence, penetrating at once and plastic, adapt itself to this labour. A profound sympathy with Nature so considered, made them familiar with her kindly meanings and half-uttered words. They set the latter to a congenial music; but they never de-

parted from the sense. In interpreting her works, they were careful to add little, and to explain nothing away. They never, like the Indian or Egyptian mythologist, sacrificed beauty to philosophy, or extended the symbol into ungainly allegory. The powers which embodied the different elements continued elemental still. If the nymph emerged from the sea,

‘Her mantle showed the yellow samphire pod,  
Her girdle the dove-coloured wave serene.’

The Hamadryad, with her labyrinthine hair, her shadowy aspect, and murmuring, scarce organic voice, seemed as native to the boughs from amid which she rose, as the bubble is to the fountain. These divinities represented nothing truly divine, because they did not include the idea of Holiness; but they were next to the divine, for they were human without the burden of mortality. The tutelary powers of hill and dale, if they kept the keys of no temple, opened out at least the ‘palace of the humanities,’ and enabled the supreme earthly being to behold his own image in every earthly shape.

We shall at once illustrate the preceding observations, and give the reader a specimen of Mr. Landor’s volume, by a few quotations from the poem called ‘The Hamadryad.’ Its merit consists chiefly in the art with which the mythological idea is blended with a human interest. A Carian youth gazes wistfully on Gnidos from the mountain side, while the rural population is thronging to the temple of Venus, to celebrate her festival. His father sends him to help in cutting down an old oak. The Hamadryad reveals herself:—

‘The youth

Inclined his ear, afar and warily,  
And cavern’d in his hand. He heard a buzz  
At first, and then the sound grew soft and clear,  
And then divided into what seemed tune,  
And there were words upon it, plaintive words.  
He turned and said, “Echion! do not strike  
That tree: it must be hollow; for some God  
Speaks from within. Come thyself near.” Again  
Both turn’d towards it: and behold! there sat  
Upon the moss below, with her two palms  
Pressing it, on each side, a maid in form,  
Downcast were her long eyelashes, and pale  
Her cheek, but never mountain-ash display’d  
Berries of colour like her lip so pure,  
Nor were the anemonies about her hair  
Soft, smooth, and wavering like the face beneath.’ (P. 33.)



The youth addresses her : —

'Who art thou? whence? why here?  
And whither would'st thou go? Among the robed  
In white or saffron, or the hue that most  
Resembles dawn or the clear sky, is none  
Array'd as thou art. What so beautiful  
As that gray robe which clings about thee close,  
Like moss to stones adhering, leaves to trees,  
Yet lets thy bosom rise and fall in turn,  
As, toucht by zephyrs, fall and rise the boughs  
Of graceful platan by the river side.'

(P. 34.)

They become lovers. Raicos, though he conceals the marvel from his father, persuades him to spare the tree; and the old man's piety receives its reward from the Hamadryad's bounty in a constant tribute of honey and of wax. For a long time the love of the mortal and the immortal meets with no disturbance; but in an evil hour the Hamadryad devises a means of proving her lover's fidelity : —

'Raicos went daily; and the nymph as oft,  
Invisible. To play at love, she knew,  
Stopping its breathings when it breathes most soft,  
Is sweeter than to play on any pipe.  
She play'd on his: she fed upon his sighs:  
They pleased her when they gently waved her hair,  
Cooling the pulses of her purple veins,  
And when her absence brought them out, they pleased.  
Even among the fondest of them all,  
What mortal or immortal maid is more  
Content with giving happiness than pain?  
One day he was returning from the wood  
Despondently. She pitied him, and said  
"Come back!" and twined her fingers in the hem  
Above his shoulder. Then she led his steps  
To a cool rill that ran o'er level sand,  
Through lentisk and through oleander, there  
Bathed she his feet, lifting them on her lap  
When bathed, and drying them in both her hands.'

\* \* \* \* \*

' "There is a bee  
Whom I have fed, a bee who knows my thoughts  
And executes my wishes: I will send  
That messenger. If ever thou art false,  
Drawn by another, own it not, but drive  
My bee away: then shall I know my fate,  
And .. for thou must be wretched .. weep at thine." '

(Pp. 40—42.)

The bee proves a trusty messenger, but not a skilful negotiator. One night it buzzes at the ear of Raicos at the moment

when he is perplexed by impending defeat at a game of drafts. Rashly and recklessly the youth raises his hand, and the bee returns to the oak, bruised and with broken wing. The legend ends thus:—

‘At this sight  
Down fell the languid brow, both hands fell down ;  
A shriek was carried to the ancient hall  
Of Thallinos : he heard it not ; his son  
Heard it, and ran forthwith into the wood.  
No bark was on the tree, no leaf was green,  
The trunk was riven through. From that day forth  
Nor word nor whisper sooth’d his ear, nor sound  
Even of insect wing : but loud laments,  
The woodmen and the shepherds one long year  
Heard day and night ; for Raicos would not quit  
The solitary place, but moan’d and died.’

(P. 44.)

It is in delineating the least pronounced part of the Greek mythology that a clear discernment of its meaning is most required. In the poem from which we have quoted, the shadowy nature of a being not so much elevated above our mortal nature as standing at one side of it, seems to us most happily indicated. Such discrimination has long been rare, both in French and in English poetry. In the gods, as described by each, the godlike element is left out ; while the heroes of antiquity are, and yet more frequently were during the last century, restored to life as courtiers and fine gentlemen, touchy about their honour, and admirable in the decorum with which they carry their wig above peplon or toga. Prior was not unfamiliar with ancient mythology ; but in his case familiarity may be said to have bred contempt ; and though many classical touches are to be found in his verses, yet, in his jocular vein, he too frequently degrades his Venuses and Cupids not less than his Chloes and Silvius. Akenside, in his ‘Hymn to the Naiads,’ presents us with forms truly antique, but the spirit of life is not in them. He imitates the ancients rather than catches their inspiration, and the repast which he lays before us, however grand, is served up cold. Dryden and Pope, men whose masculine understandings and manifold accomplishments must, despite the caprices that affect public taste, long preserve for them the high place they have occupied, largely as they translated from the ancient poets, never entered into the genius of the ancient mythology. The spirit of Theocritus is not to be found in Dryden’s version of his Idyls. In his noble ‘Ode on St. Cecilia’s Day’ it has been well remarked that when he makes Bacchus show ‘his honest face,’ he wholly misses the mythic idea of the mysterious divinity whom he vulgarises. Pope, in his ode on the same occasion, is still more un-

fortunate; and although, in his 'Tartarus,' Proserpine is stern and Orpheus devoted, while Ixion, Sisyphus, and the Furies, 'do ' what they ought to do ' with laudable industry, we lack, notwithstanding, both the awfulness and the serenity of the Elysian region.

Nor has ancient mythology fared much better in the hands of most of our recent poets. They have loved it more; but their love has often been as indiscriminating as that of a wood-god for a fugitive nymph. They have not always appreciated the character of divinities, even when exhibited in sculpture before their eyes. Lord Byron, in his 'Childe Harold,' describing the Venus de Medicis, asks the goddess whether she appeared 'in ' this guise ' to Paris, or to 'more deeply blessed Anchises,' or to Mars more fortunate still; and then follows a rhapsody about 'lava-kisses, melting while they burn,' showered on the cheek of the recumbent war-god. Such a group would hardly have suggested itself to the imagination of a Greek sculptor about to embody a Phedra; and is in strange contrast with the Venus of the Florentine Tribune, that beautiful and passionless impersonation of the morning star. Elaborate blunders in a case of this kind are the less pardonable, because it is especially through the interpretation of Greek art that the several characters of Greek divinities are to be distinguished. We require no allusive attribute, neither quivered shoulder nor crescented brow, to recognise a Dian in those feet, firm and alert, though for the moment arrested, that slender but sinewy form, and, above all, the far-projected Apollonian glance, clear as the beams of the sister luminary embodied. With the form, equally girlish but simply joyous and blameless, of a Hebe or a Grace, such a divinity was almost as strikingly contrasted as with a Pallas, a goddess chaste as the Huntress that outsped the shafts of Love, but chaste from the collected sternness of self-sufficing strength, and from the high wisdom, confederate with virtue, which subdued the presuming with its Gorgon and presided over every industrious art. The character of a Venus was expressed not less plainly, in early ages of art, by the union of perfect beauty with a reserve and sacredness which belongs to the maternal relation, and in later by the languishing and humid eye, the lips entwreathed with smiles and dubious look, the narrow shoulders, the marvellously-moulded form, slightly developed and yet luxuriant, in which numberless and incalculable curves were lost in one another, and finally by the slender feet, and the tread, at once confiding and insecure, apparently accustomed to a more unstable element than earth. The genius of a nation's poetry will ever be exhibited in its other arts,—at least, in those it

cultivates,—as the latent spirit of its philosophy is disclosed in its laws.

The merit of Mr. Landor's poetry consists so much more in the grace of his narratives, the skill with which they are worked out, and the perfection of their proportions, than in particular passages, that our extracts, we fear, will do it little justice. We meet the beautiful Hamadryad once more in the tale of Acon and Rhodope. On the anniversary of that day so fatal to her and to her lover, the oak is visited by a plighted youth and maid, who exchange love vows beneath its black and blasted branches. The father of Acon is rich, and does not choose that his son should marry without an ample dowry. The youth laments, but submits, and the girl is deserted. The contrast between the two is touchingly given:—

'Rhodope, in her soul's waste solitude,  
Sate mournful by the dull-resounding sea,  
Often not hearing it, and many tears  
Had the cold breezes hardened on her cheek.  
Meanwhile he sauntered in the wood of oaks,  
Nor shunn'd to look upon the hollow stone  
That held the milk and honey, nor to lay  
His plighted hand where recently 'twas laid  
Opposite her's, when finger playfully  
Advanced and pusht back finger, on each side.  
He did not think of this, as she would do  
If she were there alone.'

(P. 48.)

Acon expiates the sacrilege he has committed in profaning by his presence a spot consecrated to fidelity. The Hamadryad visits him in a dream as, oppressed by the heat of the day, he falls asleep beneath her tree. Gently she leads him on through a wood, glowing at first with all the glories of vernal life, but, ere long, wintry and bare. Sternly she rebukes him for having desecrated her haunt, and commands him to return to his home, and find there what happiness he may. Acon dies, and the hard father

'Had land enough: it held his only son.'

The tale of 'Enallos and Cymodameia' celebrates, on the other hand, the tutelary care of the powers who reward constancy and truth. Apollo, in a vision, commands three young men to lead forth a colony to the Isle of Lemnos; warning them at the same time that they must propitiate Neptune, by flinging a virgin alive into the sea. The oracle is declared; and, though the maidens of the parent city are not unwilling to form households in a new land, they refuse to sail until the victim has already been found, and the sacrifice been completed. One ex-

ception, however, there is: Cymodameia had dreamed that her betrothed lover had been cast into the deep, and that she had saved him. Secretly she embarks in the same ship with the youths, and is found at noon hidden among the cloaks and high-piled fruits. The third day the storm falls on the sea, and the scowling waves demand their victim. The crew call to mind the oracle, and unmoved, in their panic, by supplications or tears, hurl the virgin into the deep. Swift 'as ring-dove after 'ring-dove,' Enallos follows her. The colony is formed, and, as years roll by,

. . . . . 'roofs  
Collected the dun wings that seek house fare;  
And presently the ruddy-bosom'd guest  
Of winter, knew the doors: then infant cries  
Were heard within: and, lastly, tottering steps  
Pattered along the image-stationed hall.'

Meantime the lovers are unforgotten; and, while beside the new hearths their story has become a tale for winter nights, Apollo looks down into the deep, and beholds them where

. . . . 'Gravely gladsome light  
Environed them with its eternal green,  
And many nymphs sat round.'

We can find room for the conclusion only. The maid of earth grows jealous of the sea nymphs, and her lover supplicates Apollo to restore her to a happier home. He is heard: —

'She saw him in the action of his prayer  
Troubled, and ran to soothe him. From the ground,  
Ere she had claspt his neck, her feet were borne.  
He caught her robe; and its white radiance rose  
Rapidly, all day long, through the green sea.  
Enallos loost not from that robe his grasp,  
But spann'd one ancle too. The swift ascent  
Had stunn'd them into slumber, sweet, serene,  
Invigorating her, nor letting loose  
The lover's arm below; albeit, at last  
It closed those eyes intently fixt thereon,  
And still as fixt in dreaming. Both were cast  
Upon an island, till'd by peaceful men  
And few . . . no port nor road accessible . .  
Fruitful and green as the abode they left,  
And warm with summer, warm with love and song.  
'Tis said that some, whom most Apollo loves,  
Have seen that island, guided by his light;  
And others have gone near it, but a fog  
Rose up between them and the lofty rocks;  
Yet they relate they saw it quite as well,  
And shepherd-boys and credulous hinds believe.'

The most deeply-toned and perhaps the most beautiful of Mr. Landor's *Hellenics* is that one which bears the name of *Corythos*, the son of *Paris* and of *Cenone*. The forsaken mother has heard of the arrival of *Philoctetes* from the island of *Lemnos*, with the arrows of *Hercules* by which the Fates had decreed that *Paris* should die. Love, or the memory of love, is stronger than all beside; and she sends her son to give his father warning. *Helen* recognises the child by his resemblance to that father, and brings him to their palace, resolved to win his affections, and thus to gain an additional hold on her husband's unsteady love. One evening, when the palace resounds with mirth, and the heart of the prince is cheered with wine, *Corythos*, eager at once and awed, stands, for the first time, before his father. Unfortunately, around his shoulders there hangs the vest which *Helen*, in former days, had worked for *Menelaus*. The woman had remembered its beauty, but had forgotten the occasion on which it was wrought. Stung with sudden rage, *Paris* leaps from his seat, strikes the young stranger with his sword; and the boy, still unrecognised, expires at his father's feet. On discovering the truth, *Paris*, overcome with despair, and seeing no longer a charm even in *Helen*, rushes forth once more to battle. At night he revisits the tomb of his son on the sea-shore; and there the fatal arrow transfixes him. He is carried, by his own command, up the steep of *Ida*. *Cenone* possessed a gift of healing herbs; but she had prayed of the *Eumenides* that from her hand aid might never come to the destroyer of her child. *Paris* demands but her love and forgiveness; and she dies with him.

The reader will linger over and return to many passages of this poem; especially to the description of *Helen*, and the lamentation of *Cenone*, as—the tears dried on her cheek by the bitter wind—she stands among the cones and the whirling pine-leaves with which the *Idean* hill is strewn, and watches her son descending to the city. We should also gladly have quoted the lines descriptive of the Trojan prince's palace, adorned with statues, golden and ivory, and with pictures, the gift of *Dædalos*, as well as the lines which describe the last visit of *Paris* to the abode of his early love. We must content ourselves, however, with a shorter extract. Wounded, and weak with loss of blood, *Paris* is left, all night, alone on the tomb of his son. His recognition in the morning is as simple and touching as the recognition of *Ulysses*.

‘ But when an iron light  
Begins to peer o’er the cold plain, and wakes  
From their brief sleep the tamer animals,  
They of the household rise, and all around

In grove, in champain, seek their absent lord,  
 And, as if there the search should be the last,  
 At his son's tomb. The race that cheers the ear  
 Of Morning with its voice, and penetrates  
 With its bold breast the woodland stiff with frost,  
 And, watchful at the gate in life's extreme,  
 Is faithful to the wretched and the poor,  
 With eyes as languid on his languid eyes  
 Looks sorrowing down, and licks them unreprieved.'

Mr. Landor's poetry has sometimes been charged with a deficiency of pathos. It is true that in general he loves rather to exhibit human life in the exhilarating and equable light of day, than tinged with the lights of a low horizon, and clouded with those extended shadows which belong especially to the declining eventide of literature. His pathos has, notwithstanding, a peculiar depth and tenderness; and though unostentatious, is very far from being infrequent. The 'Death of Artemidora' may serve as a specimen.

'Artemidora! Gods invisible,  
 While thou art lying faint along the couch,  
 Have tied the sandal to thy slender feet  
 And stand beside thee, ready to convey  
 Thy weary steps where other rivers flow.  
 Refreshing shades will waft thy weariness  
 Away, and voices like thy own come near  
 And nearer, and solicit an embrace.'

Artemidora sigh'd, and would have prest  
 The hand now pressing hers, but was too weak.  
 Iris stood over her dark hair unseen,  
 While thus Elpenor spake. He lookt into  
 Eyes that had given light and life erewhile  
 To those above them, but now dim with tears  
 And wakefulness. Again he spake of joy  
 Eternal. At that word, that sad word, *joy*,  
 Faithful and fond, her bosom heav'd once more:  
 Her head fell back: and now a loud deep sob  
 Swell'd thro' the darken'd chamber; 'twas not hers.' (P. 60.)

Very different in the character of its pathos is the tragic scene entitled the 'Madness of Orestes.' It commences thus:—

'*Orestes.* Heavy and murderous dreams, O my Electra,  
 Have dragged me from myself.

Is this Mycenni?

Are we... are all who should be... in our house?  
 Living? unhurt? our father here? our mother?  
 Why that deep gasp? for 'twas not sigh nor groan.  
 She then... 'twas she who fell! When? how? beware!

No, no, speak out at once, that my full heart  
May meet it, and may share with thee in all..  
In all.. but that one thing.

It was a dream.

We may share all.

They live? both live?

Oh, say it!

*Electra.* The Gods have placed them from us, and there rolls  
Between us that dark river....

*Orestes.*

Blood! blood! blood!

I see it roll; I see the hand above it,

Imploring; I see *her*.

Hiss me not back,

Ye snake-haired maids! I will look on; I will

Hear the words gurgle thro' that cursed stream,

And catch that hand.. that hand.. which slew my father!

It cannot be.. how could it slay my father?

Death to the slave that spoke it!.. Slay my father!

It tost me up to him to earn a smile,

And was a smile then such a precious boon,

And royal state and proud affection nothing?

Ay, and thee too, *Electra*, she once taught

To take the sceptre from him at the door.

Not the bath-door, not the bath-door, mind that!..

And place it in the vestibule, against

The spear of *Pallas*, where it used to stand.'

(Pp. 82, 83.)

If Mr. Landor's various dramas were braced and animated by such a spirit as sustains the fragment of which we have quoted the earlier lines, few modern dramatists would stand on his level. Such, however, is not the fact. Many dramatic gifts are fatally marred by one deficiency. He has not, apparently, the faculty of devising a plot in which incident not only follows, but results from, incident; while each and all, instead of being connected merely by the chain of phenomenal causation, rest on a moral support, and illustrate character. Mr. Landor is accordingly more successful in his fragmentary dramatic scenes than in his dramas, none of which appear to us written with the same power, either in the delineation of character or of passion, which is to be found in many of his 'Imaginary Conversations;' as, for instance, in that true prose poem, the dialogue between *Tiberius* and *Vipsania*; or that one between *Peleus* and *Thetis*, in which a mournful passion is so marvellously introduced into a subject belonging, it might seem, exclusively to the imagination. Among his dramatic fragments is a poem entitled 'Luther's Parents,' remarkable for its combination of humour with a rich fancy and domestic tenderness. *Martin's* mother has seen, in a dream, an infant radiant as the stars, who holds a



sword at which 'tottering shapes, in purple filagree,' tug in vain, and round whom devils with angel faces throng without appalling him. Her ambition is fired. She has hopes that her child may one day be a chorister; and she ruminates the several steps of advance to which so high a beginning might possibly lead, till her more impatient husband—an honest peasant—anticipates the goal of such reveries, and exclaims,—not without some particle of truth,—

'Ring the bells! Martin is Pope, by Jove!'

This poem originally appeared in the 'Tribute,' a volume published for the benefit of the family of the late Mr. Smedley; and we are glad to see that it has been reprinted in the recent complete edition of Mr. Landon's works.

Scattered among Mr. Landon's works are to be found many passages of philosophical poetry. The following lines, the commencement of a poem called 'Regeneration,' will show the style, in which these graver thoughts are wrought into the pattern of fanciful and embroidered verse:—

'We are what suns and winds and waters make us;  
The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills  
Fashion and win their nursling with their smiles.  
But where the land is dim from tyranny,  
There tiny pleasures occupy the place  
Of glories and of duties; as the feet  
Of fabled fairies, when the sun goes down,  
Trip o'er the grass where wrestlers strove by day.  
Then Justice, called the Eternal one above,  
Is more inconstant than the buoyant form  
That burst into existence from the froth  
Of ever-varying ocean: what is best  
Then becomes worst; what loveliest, most deformed.  
The heart is hardest in the softest climes,  
The passions flourish, the affections die.' (P. 274.)

Another of Mr. Landon's political poems is addressed 'To Corinth.' The concluding lines are better, we think, in expression than in sentiment:—

'Confide then in thy strength, and unappall'd  
Look down upon the plain, while yokemate kings  
Run bellowing where their herdsman goad them on.  
Instinct is sharp in them, and terror true.  
They smell the floor whereon their necks must lie.'

With Mr. Landon's political creed we can by no means agree. Referring to it only so far as it connects itself with poetical aspirations, we may observe that it seems to us strangely to merge the ethical character of the modern world in the poetical and poli-

tical associations of the ancient. Even if Europe should at some future period be covered with republics, those republics will, we suspect, bear a yet smaller resemblance to the republics of antiquity than to the monarchies of the present day. Old names may be revived; but it is impossible to restore the spirit of the institutions which they designate, and which fell to pieces for the most part, because, congenial as they had been to the ethical system of early Greece and Italy, they stood in no such relation to the religion, the morals, and the manners which superseded that system. Republics in modern times have resembled those of antiquity sometimes in their aggressive spirit, and sometimes in their sanction of slavery, but seldom, especially when tried on a large scale, in the qualities which might recommend republican institutions to men attached to the most striking associations of antiquity. The merely political question is, however, beyond our present theme.

We regret being obliged to leave so many of the Hellenics unnoticed; especially that *Idyl*, replete with the spirit of Theocritus, in which the love of Pan for the nymph Pitys is sung, together with the jealousy of Boreas, his rival. To poems of an earlier date than the Hellenics we shall proceed to refer briefly—not in the vain hope of introducing real lovers of poetry into a region not already trodden by their feet, but—for the purpose of illustrating from a larger range of his poetry, the qualities most characteristic of Mr. Landor. The longest and most important of his poems is ‘*Gebir*,’ the tale of the Iberian chief who, in vindication of his ancestral claims, undertook the conquest of Egypt; and who, when (smitten by the charms of Charoba, the young queen of that land) he had abandoned the enterprise, was slain at the marriage-feast by the treachery of Dalica, her nurse. It is perhaps in this poem that we meet most abundantly with instances of Mr. Landor’s extraordinary descriptive power. The following lines may be taken as an example. Charoba, alarmed at the approach of her unknown enemy, has resolved to win him by persuasion to terms of peace:—

‘But Gebir, when he heard of her approach,  
Laid by his orbed shield; his vizor-helm,  
His buckler and his corset he laid by,  
And bade that none attend him: at his side  
Two faithful dogs that urge the silent course,  
Shaggy, deep-chested, croucht; the crocodile  
Crying, oft made them raise their flaccid ears  
And push their heads within their master’s hand.  
There was a brightening paleness in his face,  
Such as Diana rising o’er the rocks  
Shower’d on the lonely Latmian; on his brow  
Sorrow there was, yet nought was there severe.

But when the royal damsel first he saw,  
 Faint, hanging on her handmaids, and her knees  
 Tottering, as from the motion of the car,  
 His eyes lookt earnest on her, and those eyes  
 Showed, if they had not, that they might have loved,  
 For there was pity in them at that hour.' (P. 488.)

The descriptive passages, so thickly scattered over the poem, are equally true to Art and to Nature, and frequently remind us of an antique relievo. Such are the lines describing a procession (book iv., line 200.) in which we read of

'Stubborn goats that eye the mountain top  
 Askance, and riot with reluctant horn.'

Invariably, also, they are characterised by brevity, as in the picture of moonlight on the sands:—

'Restless then ran I to the highest ground  
 To watch her: she was gone; gone down the tide;  
 And the long moonbeam on the hard wet sand  
 Lay like a jasper column half uprear'd.'

Not less in the spirit of antiquity is the following image:

'And now the chariot of the Sun descends,  
 The waves rush hurried from his foaming steeds,  
 Smoke issues from their nostrils at the gate,  
 Which, when they enter, with huge golden bar  
 Atlas and Calpè close across the sea.'

The Objectivity — (for it is in vain any longer to refuse admission to this unpleasing but useful word,) — the Objectivity which so remarkably characterises Greek poetry nowhere makes itself more perceived than in the Greek conception of Love. In the middle ages that passion was elevated, by the influence of Christianity and of its offspring, chivalry, into an imaginative worship. The objects of this devotion belonged to an ethereal region of seclusion and mystery, shining with benign virtue on the ways of men, but rather rewarding adoration than reciprocating passion. The love described in modern literature has descended from the firmamental region to that of the clouds; and if it continues loftier in its character than that delineated by the ancients, it is vaguer also, and more indeterminate. Love, as conceived by the Greeks, was neither ennobled by sentiment, nor weakened by sentimentalities. It neither languished in love-sickness, nor flamed up, like a wandering meteor, an irreligious substitute for religion. It was a plain, honest passion, — ardent, joyous, and earnest; pure, at least, from all morbid consciousness, and going straight, like a sun-shaft, to its object. As such it is portrayed by Mr. Landor. In the person

of the sea-nymph who has become enamoured of Tamar, the shepherd brother of Gebir, it is expressed with the wild, spontaneous impulse which belongs to the elemental Powers, touched but by the fleeting shadows of humanity:—

‘Return me him who won my heart,’ return  
Him whom my bosom pants for, as the steeds  
In the sun’s chariot for the western wave.’

In a mortal maiden the same passion is very differently indicated:—

‘I since have watcht her in each lone retreat,  
Have heard her sigh, and soften out the name;  
Then would she change it for Egyptian sounds  
More sweet, and seem to taste them on her lips,  
Then loathe them; *Gebir, Gebir* still returned.

\* \* \* \* \*

Lone in the gardens, on her gathered vest  
How gently would her languid arm recline!  
How often have I seen her kiss a flower,  
And on cool mosses press her glowing cheek!’

Among the severer tests of artistic skill in poetry may be included the use or abuse of Episode. In nothing else have the ancient poets shown a finer executive tact. Too often in modern narrative an episode is but an impertinent interruption, swelling its bulk, and checking its progress: And this is ever likely to be the case when it is introduced merely as an ornament. Among the functions of an episode one is to relieve the graver tenour of a poem, by the introduction of an interest subordinate to and yet congenial with its main interest, or at once analogous to it, and contrasted with it. Toward the end of a poem, an episode, especially a short one, often only adds to the reader’s interest by the interposition of an obstacle, leading him away from that which he would fain explore, as the parent bird lures the intruder from her nest. In this department of the poetic art Mr. Landor is very felicitous: As an instance we may cite the episode of the marriage of Tamar, in the sixth book. It illustrates also our remarks on the relation in which Nature stands to the Greek mythology. The sea nymph, the morning after her espousals, desires to withdraw the thoughts of her mortal bridegroom from the evil omens which threaten his brother.

“O, seek not destin’d evils to divine,  
Found out at last too soon! cease here the search,  
’Tis vain, ’tis impious, ’tis no gift of mine.”

She touches Tamar’s eyes, and the wonders of the watery realm pass before them.

" Thus we may sport at leisure when we go  
 Where, lov'd by Neptune and the Naiad, lov'd  
 By pensive Dryad palé, and Oread,  
 The sprightly Nymph whom constant Zephyr woos,  
 Rhine rolls his beryl-colour'd wave; than Rhine  
 What river from the mountains ever came  
 More stately? Most the simple crown adorns  
 Of rushes and of willows intertwined  
 With here and there a flower: his lofty brow  
 Shaded with vines and misletoc and oak  
 He rears, and mystic bards his fame resound.  
 Or gliding opposite, th' Illyrian gulph  
 Will harbour us from ill." While thus she spake  
 She toucht his eyelashes with libant lip  
 And breath'd ambrosial odours, o'er his cheek  
 Celestial warmth suffusing: grief disperst,  
 And strength and pleasure beam'd upon his brow.  
 Then pointed she before him: first arose  
 To his astonisht and delighted view  
 The sacred isle that shrines the queen of love.  
 It stood so near him, so acute each sense,  
 That not the symphony of lutes alone,  
 Or coo serene, or billing strife of doves,  
 But murmurs, whispers, nay, the very sighs  
 Which he himself had utter'd once, he heard.  
 Next, but long after and far off, appear  
 The cloud-like cliffs and thousand towers of Crete,  
 And further to the right, the Cyclades;  
 Phœbus had rais'd, and fixt them, to surround  
 His native Delos, and aerial fane.  
 He saw the land of Pelops, host of Gods;  
 Saw the steep ridge where Corinth after stood  
 Beckoning the serious with the smiling Arts  
 Into her sun-bright bay: unborn the maid  
 That to assure the bent-up hand unskill'd  
 Lookt oft, but oftener fearing who might wake.  
 He heard the voice of rivers: he descried  
 Pindan Peneus and the slender nymphs  
 That tread his banks, but fear the thundering tide:  
 These, and Amphrysos, and Apidanos,  
 And poplar-crowned Sperchios, and, reclined  
 On restless rocks, Enipeus, where the winds  
 Scatter'd above the weeds his hoary hair.  
 Then, with Pirenè and with Panopé,  
 Evenos, troubled from paternal tears,  
 And last was Acheloüs, king of Isles.' (Book vi. line 116.)

The chief fault of 'Gebir,' we should say, was its occasional  
 obscurity: an obscurity, indeed, of more kinds than one. In one  
 or two places the story is not distinctly made out. A few lines

interposed here and there would be sufficient to clear up all doubt, which indeed, in the Latin version, is precluded by the argument prefixed, that excellent invention of times when the interest of a novel was not sought in poetry, and when no surprise was thought necessary. The ancients, treating in general themes well known, threw their narrative poems into large masses, and often neglected the connecting link of mere detail, by which part is joined to part; influenced no doubt by the same aversion to the trivial and the accessory, which made the Greek sculptor abstain from connecting the head of the horse with the hand of the rider by a marble bridle. Their habit in this respect, — a habit which Mr. Landor has adopted, — will frequently lead to obscurity, unless great care be taken to avoid it by a skilful dove-tailing together of the several parts. ‘Gebir,’ as he informs us, was reduced before publication to half the length at which it was originally written. In making reductions an author does not always observe when the meaning which still stands clear in his own mind, and which was originally impressed with equal clearness on his work, has been allowed to slip from before the eye of a reader. It is not, however, in Mr. Landor’s narrative only that we complain of obscurity. Several of the meditative passages in ‘Gebir’ not only refuse to give up their whole meaning on a first reading, (for to thus much we should not object when occasioned by depth of thought), but remain even after much reflection more or less equivocal. We may cite as instances the passage in which the analogy between fear and love is pointed out (book iv. line 20.); and, though in a less degree, a passage on despondency (book vi. p. 84.).

In Mr. Landor’s minor poems the fault we have named proceeds chiefly from an extreme condensation of language, from a certain degree of mannerism, apparently the unconscious result of classical associations, and perhaps from that elaborate refinement, which, in adding one grace more to a fine passage, sometimes mars its effect by a sacrifice of simplicity. Still more often, no doubt, it is produced by excessive subtlety, both of thought and of sentiment. To avert such obscurity is one of the functions of strong poetic sympathy, which should ever be included among a poet’s attributes. A poet should write for the many, while he thinks for the few; and should be charitable enough to sympathise as warmly with the stupidity of the dullest reader, as he would wish an apprehensive reader to sympathise with his highest flights. Care in such a matter is not thrown away. How much, for instance, does not the nobly-written poem addressed ‘to Corinth’ suffer from the obscurity of the

last line in the following passage? The flight of Medea is spoken of,—she has just hurled her two children from the fiery car, and the perfidious father bends over their dead bodies,—

‘ Warm, soft, motionless,  
As flowers in stillest noon before the sun,  
They lie three paces from him: such they lie  
As when he left them sleeping side by side,  
A mother’s arm round each, a mother’s cheeks  
Between them, flusht with happiness and love.  
He was more changed than they were, doomed to show  
Thee and the stranger, how defaced and scarr’d  
Grief hunts us down the precipice of years,  
And whom the faithless prey upon the last.’

Among the later of Mr. Landor’s poems are many of his best: others among them are inferior in vividness and energy to his ‘Gebir.’ ‘The last of Ulysses,’ for instance, seems to us comparatively relaxed in tone; an effect produced in part by the circumstance that the metre is less braced, the pause being often thrown into the earlier part of the line, while the final word is also less frequently emphatic. A similar metrical change took place in Milton’s later blank verse as compared with his earlier. In conjunction with another, though perhaps unintentional alteration, the diminished frequency of vowelled alliterations, (the ear of the blind bard grasping apparently the amplest combinations of sounds,) this change contributed much no doubt to the variety and the stateliness of his versification. The perfection of blank verse consists, however, in its adaptation to its theme; and in Mr. Landor’s narratives we enjoy most the metre that rushes past us in a smooth though rapid stream.

To return to the less captious part of our critical task. It is in Mr. Landor’s minor poems that we find most abundantly that delicacy, propriety, sweetness, and concise precision, which so eminently distinguish his poetry, and remind us of the Greek anthology. Among many such poems it is difficult to make a selection. The following, however, may serve:—

‘ Ianthe! you are call’d to cross the sea!  
A path forbidden *me*!  
Remember, while the Sun his blessing sheds  
Upon the mountain-heads,  
How often we have watcht him laying down  
His brow, and dropt our own  
Against each other’s, and how faint and short  
And sliding the support!  
What will succeed it now? Mine is unblest,  
Ianthe! nor will rest  
But on the very thought that swells with pain.  
O bid me hope again!

O give me back what Earth, what (without you),  
Not Heaven itself can do,  
One of the golden days that we have past ;  
And let it be my last !  
Or else the gift would be, however sweet,  
Fragile and incomplete.'

Mr. Landor seems to turn with aversion from many forms of composition to which recent poetry has habituated us. A ballad is not to be found among his works ; nor a didactic poem ; nor a sonnet ; nor, we might say, a song, using the term in its stricter sense. The temperament of his poetry, buoyant at once and serene, lacks apparently that vehement excitability which precipitates itself into fragmentary snatches of music, such as the songs of our early dramatists. Among his poems, on the other hand, we find many species with which we are familiarised in ancient poetry. The Idyl, especially that larger and graver kind for which, in his Latin volume, he claims the title of ' *Idyllia* ' *Heroica*, appears to be his favourite ; but he is also attached to the elegiac commemoration, to the brief but pregnant inscription, and to the epigram, especially to that species of epigram which embodies poetry not wit, and which can dispense with a sting in the last line. These poems are frequently marked by a playful tenderness, and as often by a tender pathos. Of the latter species the following may be taken as specimens :—

' Mild is the parting year, and sweet  
The odour of the falling spray ;  
Life passes on more rudely fleet,  
And balmless is its closing day.  
I wait its close, I court its gloom,  
But mourn that never must there fall,  
Or on my breast or on my tomb,  
The tear that would have sooth'd it all.'

In the following there is an Epicurean view of mournfulness :—

' The place where soon I think to lie,  
In its old creviced nook hard by  
Rears many a weed :  
If parties bring you there, will you  
Drop slyly in a grain or two  
Of wall-flower seed ?  
I shall not see it, and (too sure)  
I shall not ever hear that your  
Light step was there :  
But the rich odour some fine day  
Will, what I cannot do, repay  
That little care.'



We find also many examples of the brief Horatian Ode, as distinguished from the Pindaric triumphant chaunt, the mythic hymn, or the choral ode. We might name as instances the graceful stanzas beginning

‘To write as your sweet mother does;’

or the yet more beautiful poem in the ‘Pericles and Aspasia,’ supposed to be addressed by Corinna to her native city, Tanagra.

The unobtrusiveness of true poetry, a quality not sufficiently valued and but infrequently exemplified of late, is among the higher characteristics of Mr. Landor’s. He is wholly free from exaggeration, and he never transgresses the Delphic precept, *Μηδὲν ἄγαν*, ‘not too much of anything.’ Nothing is inserted for effect; and his best passages, contented often to lurk in shadow, are never rendered more salient by a sprinkling of ‘barbaric pearl and gold.’ Thus, in his pages, heroism never struts, and sorrow never wails. Seldom, indeed, has fine poetry more ascetically renounced finery, or passion more religiously abstained from bluster. It is these qualities which impart to his verse that gentlemanly character which is observed to belong to it. Unobtrusiveness is not, however, likely to conduce to the popularity of a poet in these days. An object must sparkle to catch immediate attention when seen through the dust of the thoroughfare; and in the press and crush of modern literature, the thought which is not forward to claim a place, is likely to wait long without one. The music which is music only will be heard but in the still gallery or lonely grove; while the louder instrument, that sounds of wood and wire also, flings its noisy peal across the clamour of the throng.

Mr. Landor’s poetry has not been popular. Warmly as the admiration of not a few among our first poets as well as scholars has been expressed with regard to it, that sentiment has not, as yet, made its way to the mass of readers. From our remarks upon that poetry, it may not unreasonably be inferred that the absence of popularity has proceeded from the peculiar character at once of its merits and of its defects. Refinement, grace, and condensed thought are not the qualities which most immediately recommend themselves to the public; and, on the other hand, there are few faults which a reader finds it more difficult to forgive than that obscurity which makes him discontented with himself as well as with the author. Mr. Landor’s prose works also have in some measure merged his poetical in his literary fame, representing, as they do, a larger portion of his mind, and embodying the stronger, though not the higher part of his genius. When, however, we are asked how far time is likely

to confirm or to modify the present estimate of his poetry, and to bring his volumes from the library-table to the garden-bench, we cannot but remember that at all times popularity depends in no small measure on other things besides the merits of the poetry in question. In the case of real merit, we believe that the testimony of time will be always true, and its judgment just; but it no more follows that popularity, properly so called, will attach itself, even in time, to all works of genuine worth, than that an immediate popularity proves the absence of that genius which can stand the test of time. There are two contrasted orders of original genius in the world; and while one of these remains fixed in isolation, or fastens its regard on some remote period, drawing inspiration thence alone, the other dwells in the present, as in its native home, without any ignoble concession, and in interpreting the present points to the future. Genius, even of the latter sort, will not, indeed, soon be adequately appreciated; or rather, it is the attribute of the highest genius as well as of the highest beauty, moral or physical, that it 'never can be wholly known;' but it can hardly wait long for a reception to a certain extent in the sympathies of men, since it throws open for many a heart its inmost chamber, and utters for multitudes what they vainly wished to say. Genius in harmony with the age, like that of Shakspeare and Burns, leaps at once to a Nation's heart: whence, ascending upwards, it makes its way to the minds which, sooner or later, direct the intelligence of the many, and to which the public looks at last for the grounds of its poetical beliefs. Genius of an order more remote and alien is tried by time, is separated, in proportion as it is sifted, from all occasional dross and stubble, is recognised by the few, is passed on to the many, and by them is received in fulness of days with pride, if not with cordial enjoyment, as a part of their inheritance.

We have already remarked that Mr. Landor's genius, not only does not sympathise with the present age, but has been, from first to last, in ardent sympathy with the imaginative and social associations of a remote era. To the Ideal as distinguished from the National school of English poetry, his poetry belongs exclusively and without admixture, being in this respect homogeneous. The question, then, as to his future popularity is part of a much larger inquiry. It is this: Do the poets of antiquity obtain the popular sympathies of our countrymen, or must we admit that they lived in the hearts of those only for whom, and among whom, they wrote, and that they can but delight the imagination of the studious at this distant day? The latter we believe to be the truth. Homer is an exception,

—for his genius, like that of Shakspeare, was universal : but the other great poets of antiquity, however religiously our ‘ reading ‘ public’ may revere them, as being of the orthodox creed, are yet the objects of a worship in which there is more of fear than of love, and more of tradition than of devotion. We set up their images in the high places of our mind, as in our streets we elevate the statues of great men on the top of pillars ; but in each case the equivocal compliment renders the features of those thus honoured indistinguishable ; and a passer-by might insinuate that we only desired to put Greatness civilly out of our way. A more charitable interpretation of the fact may, perhaps, lead us to a deeper truth. The insensibility of the many to that high poetry, the spirit of which is alien to that of the age, may proceed, not from egotism or dulness merely, but from the truthfulness of human sympathies and the grave appeals of poetry itself. It may be a lesson, teaching us that poetry does not merely spring from high-wrought phantasies ; but that, as an emanation from man’s total being, in its most popular form, it is a practical thing, rooted in realities, embodying the complete mind of a nation, and corresponding with the estimate formed by that nation on every important subject, — religion, philosophy, politics, nature, art, science—as well as with its morals and manners. We have already seen how closely allied Greek poetry was to the Greek idea of nature, and to a Pantheistic worship. In further illustration of the subject, we shall hazard a few remarks on the connexion between that poetry and some other characteristics of Greek mind and society.

The main characteristic unquestionably of Greek poetry was its embodiment of Beauty ; and the attribute which gave expression to its every gesture was Grace. These qualities it marvellously united with a plain masculine strength, equably developed and exercised without violent effort. It was lofty without being aspiring, and firmly seated from the breadth, not the depth, of its foundation. It ascended into no pinnacles, and descended into no crypts, but extended its solid lines level with ordinary apprehensions, though in proportions so fine that while many recognised the effect, few could trace it to its cause. Absolute perfection in the treatment of its theme was the artistic aim of Greek poetry : for this reason the same historical record or religious mythus afforded a subject to poet after poet. It did not, for the sake of variety, affect a complex intermixture of human interests and sensibilities. From whatever was intricate, evanescent, or shadowy, it revolted as inconsistent with simplicity in all subjects, and with grandeur in subjects of an elevated character. Above all, Greek poetry, except in the case of tra-

gedy, excluded the mysterious. Its nymph-like muse was not to take her stand among the Caryatides; and the Temple's projecting cornice was neither to depress nor to overshadow that face radiant even in its stillness—

‘Fit countenance for the soul of primal truth,  
The bland composure of eternal youth.’

The art of Song was part of the art of Life, and that art turned away from all perplexing problems. In shrinking from the painful Greek poetry lost the profound, and in abjuring the mysterious it missed the spiritual likewise. It possesses on the other hand its compensating advantages; the crown of its excellence consisting in that sustained majesty which can only stand palpably out where solidity of material is united with perfect proportions in a structure neither too vast to be comprehended by the eye, nor too complex to be understood by it at a glance.

It is hardly necessary to remark in detail on the degree in which these characteristics are to be found in the other Greek Arts. Greek music we know relied mainly upon melody not harmony, the former satisfying the mind by the completeness and symmetrical arrangement of a definite series of sounds, while the latter stimulates it to seek analogies in a world without limits. The resemblance between Greek poetry and Greek architecture,—the latter extending its level lines over the solid ground, which the perpendicular Gothic spurns in heavenward aspiration,—has been so often insisted on, that we need not further allude to it. For the same reason, we abstain from any comment on the analogy between Greek poetry and Greek sculpture. We may, however, observe that that analogy is attested and illustrated by the fact that the distinguishing characteristics of Greek sculpture—its ideality, its serenity, its unity, its distinct embodiment of a beautiful idea, detached from all accessories, and dependent upon no associations of time, place, or circumstance,—disappeared in the sculpture of the Middle Ages, when the latter asserted a native character of its own. As a proof, we might refer to the Moses of Michael Angelo, to the monuments of the Medicean mausoleum in the church of San Lorenzo, and to much of that early ecclesiastical sculpture, the spirit of which, despite the stubborn material, obviously tends to the picturesque, not the antique. The paintings of the ancients conversely were strictly congenial with their sculpture, as we may infer from the descriptions of them which have come down to us, as well as from the qualities for which they were especially admired. The frescoes disinterred at Pompeii and elsewhere, though in point of execution very imperfect spe-

cimens of ancient painting, are yet sufficient to exhibit its spirit. What that art expressed was Beauty perfect in a finite mould, and a pleasurable sense of healthful life, sometimes contrasted with, but more often united to that majestic forbearance and chaste reserve which the Graces themselves ordain. Greek painting illustrated but the simpler of the affections, forcibly and delicately as it illustrated them. Its compass was narrow; and neither in sentiment nor in composition did it seek after various or ample combinations. It differed from sculpture but little except in its superior vivacity. In other respects, comparing the livelier with the austerer art, one might have imagined that the notes of some lyre, potent as that of Amphion, had dissolved the immovability of the marble, and commanded the still Relief to float along the frescoed wall or enwreath the encaustic vase. How opposite in character is the painting of the Middle Ages, so devoutly domiciled in a region of spiritual aspirations and spiritualised affections! Even when it fell from its first estate, how marvellously transformed, under its influences, is the ancient mythology itself! We recollect but one complete exception. In the Idyl pictures of Nicolo Poussin we find the true genius of antiquity; — the exuberant life, the beauty not lost even in Bacchanal riot, the vehement appetite,\* oppressed by no 'dishonest shame,' but unelevated by the 'seriousness' of passion; while, amid the rout, a blameless and buoyant Humanity steps forward, like a new-born Goddess, over the subject waves of the revelry, — unparticipant of, and not desiring, the gift and burden of a spiritual life.

The analogy between Greek poetry and the other Arts is scarcely more intimate than that between the same poetry and the metaphysics and politics of Greece. One of our best scholars\* has remarked, perhaps quaintly, upon the difference between our philosophic term 'understanding,' and the corresponding Greek word *ἐπιστήμη*, the first syllable of which means, not *under*, but *upon*. It is thus, he subtly concludes, that modern intelligence confesses that the region of its knowledge is above it; while the Greek mind looks down, as it were, upon a world of conquered thought. We need hardly suggest how closely this intellectual habit corresponded with the character we have ascribed to Greek poetry, which treated of nothing that it could not master, and owed half its grace to the fact that, like children, it never felt the weight of its own body — which never wandered into any scenes but what it could contemplate as from a height, — and whose view of things was but little shadowed by that faculty

---

\* 'Guesses at Truth.'

which 'looks before and after.' The whole of the Greek mythology bears the same character of limitation united with congruity and systematic beauty. It accounts for all things by the expansion of one great hypothesis, embracing in its interwoven cycles and epicycles a single sphere of thought, though the largest, probably, and the most complete that ever issued, there or elsewhere, from uninspired humanity. Once more—it has been noticed that Greek poetry, in its delineation of character and manners, was averse to the merely individual; tending to the generic, and seldom condescending to those minuter details of heart and hearth by which the peculiarities of personal character are marked. In this respect we must observe that in so doing it but corresponded with the polity of ancient communities, in which the individual was identified with the State, liberty itself meaning rather national independence than personal freedom. The largest affection which a Greek felt was that for his country; and the fortress-crowned acropolis which represented it was perhaps his most truly religious idea. He had heard of no 'abiding country' beyond his native soil, and of no 'City' of which all mankind are citizens. Neither had his personal nature been exalted by a Faith which, in making every man the representative of the Race, communicates to the individual being, and to those domestic relations in which eternal ties are emblemized, a worth otherwise not theirs.

It is, however, in the department of Greek ethics and morals that we shall discover the most authentic traces of Greek poetry. The noblest moral conception of the Greek mind was that of Justice. Justice accordingly, in the form of just Retribution, was the great idea which inspired Greek tragedy. No corresponding conception, however, then existed of a Mercy and Love, strong as Justice itself, and neither mastered by, nor superseding it. The moral poetry of the Greeks, for this reason, is marked by a character of severity. Their Elysian fields are more remote than the kingdom which Rhadamanthus judges; and even in them the shade of Achilles rejects homage as a mockery, and declares that it is better to labour as a slave in the upper air 'than rule, the sceptred monarch of the dead.' The practical idea of Virtue with the Greeks consisted mainly in the becoming, the seemly, the fit: the *το αγαθον* meant the *το καλον* and the *το πρεπον*; and the moral taste, rather than the conscience, was the arbiter of it. In harmony with such sentiments was the fine balance of their poetry, which admitted nothing overstrained or disorderly. That Moderation so highly extolled in the Grecian philosophy presided with them over every art: and, as in Plato's 'Banquet' the guests begin by discussing whether

they are to drink to intoxication, or for the sake of pleasure merely, so in every intellectual feast likewise the 'law of not too much' was deemed the limit of rational enjoyment. Against excess, even of the noblest sort, their canons of taste were inflexibly severe; and Æschylus narrowly escaped banishment because one of his tragedies had excited the feelings of the spectators over-vehemently.

How different from such a conception of Virtue was that high idea, of a maturer time, which, though including, yet superseded it! How many of those attributes illustrated in the pictures and the chivalrous and religious poetry of the Middle Ages (not to appeal here to graver authorities) could possibly have been rendered even intelligible to a Greek? What, for instance, would he have thought of religious Zeal, and of the enterprise of the missionary? Not believing in any revelation of objective truth, he could hardly (however useful and auspicious religious worship might have seemed to him) have regarded it as a duty to maintain and to propagate a Faith. To the sceptic, indifferentism must necessarily have seemed to be both charity and common sense; and the heroism of the chiefs who sailed in search of the Golden Fleece must appear to him far more commendable than the self-devotion of St. Augustine and his monks voyaging in search of a barbarous race, and boldly claiming 'not theirs, but them.' Again, what would a Greek have thought of Obedience as a law of life? If he did not brand it as a want of spirit only worthy of Orientals and slaves, assuredly he would have seen little dignity in it. As incomprehensible to him would Humility have been. Wisdom is not likely to be humble in the absence of Revelation; for all its knowledge has been found in its own stores, or gleaned by its own hands: and Virtue must needs walk proudly where, except the strength that is in itself, it sees none. The Homeric heroes always praise themselves; and the whole Greek race vaunted, not only of its achievements as a race, but of man's physical position in creation; boasting that it was 'articulate-speaking,' and 'horse-taming,' and that it compelled the earth (though a Goddess) to give forth her fruits. Revelation, meantime, like the Copernican System of the Universe, translated man from a finite to an infinite region.\* It has shown him at once his actual littleness and his potential greatness, and accordingly has taught him that true magnanimity consists not in self-assertion, but in self-renunciation and self-oblivion. Heroism, in ancient song, always seeks and finds a present reward of fame, if not of success. Men were called 'godlike' where God was not known. Hence, the heroes of the ancient world shine

like the stars by night: the saints of the Christian Church, buried in a light greater than their own, glimmer like tapers by day, or are clustered together like the dimly seen luminaries of a nebula. Glory itself does not necessarily minister to pride: it may unite, not separate; rendering greatness not *distinguished*, but *conspicuous*. In the great Christian poem of the Middle Ages a thousand crusading Spirits form but a single halo, projected, in shape a cross, against that ruddy sphere, — their celestial home. Fifteen hundred years had passed away before a modified Tragedy revived, and man was again bidden to gaze in wonder upon individual man.

The Greek estimate of human Well-being accorded justly with such an idea of Virtue. The celebrated adage, '*Mens sana in corpore sano*,' might well describe it. Such an estimate necessarily repudiates the austerity of self-denial as much as the lawless gratification of the passions. It does not aspire to bring the body under: it wishes, simply, that body and soul should live amicably together, neither of them a tyrant, and neither of them subjugated. It does not believe that by renouncing the lower gratifications, which a fallen nature can hardly use freely without abusing, a larger participation may be obtained of higher joys. Mortification it counts an Indian extravagance; and vigil it leaves to the priestess of Diana, solitary beneath the stars, in her rock-built tower. Regarding the body not as the temple of a spirit, but as the most beautiful and vigorous of instruments, it places a proportionate value upon wealth; and even the religious Pindar, extolling the objects of his respect, celebrates them as '*good and rich*,'—a mark of their being dear to the gods. Greek poetry corresponded, by necessity, with Pagan, not Christian, beatitudes. It never recorded the blessedness of those who mourn, the inward abundance of the poor, or the large fruition of terrestrial things extended, by Nature as well as by Grace, to those meek spirits who can enjoy without possessing. It commemorated sometimes the constancy of the martyr, counting as such those who sacrificed their lives in a righteous cause, but never their triumphant death-beds. It flung upon the grave the chaplets of a pensive fancy; but the grave returned no vernal symbols of immortality with which the shrines of religion were to be decked. Yet it did what it could. It embalmed the memory of the brave; and in its breeze of martial music it carried the patriot band to the frontier. It harmonised the rural dance, and added order to the village festival. It caused a sad hour to be forgotten an hour sooner than it would otherwise have been, and a glad moment to be remembered an age later. Its matutinal feet were hurried



by no attraction to the angel-haunted tomb; but it polished the funeral urn, and it encompassed the sarcophagus with laughing nymphs.

As Greek religion consisted chiefly in the worship of visible Nature embodied in human forms, and generally in the deification of Humanity, so, in Greek ethics, Inhumanity was the chief, if not the only grave offence. Whatever sprang from that root the Greeks abhorred. Cruelty and tyranny they would have no dealings with: sins of another sort they regarded with an indulgent eye. For this reason, in the intercourse of daily life, though they affected not the magnanimous urbanity of the aristocratic Romans, a friendly address and graceful bearing were regarded as a part of good morals. The same character belongs to all their arts. Their poetry is by nothing more characterised than by its cordiality, its communicativeness, and its pleasant aspect. It recoils from the rude, the boisterous, and the insolent, as from a species of blasphemy; and satire it leaves to Thersites. But what if a poet born later—he, let us suppose, who saw the Triple Vision—could have conversed with a brother bard of Greece, and spoken to him of a Divine awe compared with which all human respect is dwarfed and brought low? What if he had told him that the temple gates all over the world had been shaken open in one night, and that the people had been bidden to enter where once the priest only stood? What if he had spoken of virtues in conformity with an elevation at once so high and so perilous,—of a revealed infinitude of light and of darkness, of bliss and bale,—of such duties as Contemplation and Purity, Aspiration and Compunction,—of eloquent lips locked close, and of curiosity repressed? The Greek bard would have called his companion a Visionary, and advised him to exchange Eleusis for Epidaurus as a place of sojourn. In other words, he would have been repelled by the ‘*Divina Commedia*.’ The same principles and instincts which consigned him to a moral system concerned with outward acts, not with affections and motives, would have attached him to a poetry material and objective. Of the merits which belong to a more spiritual poetry he must, with all his keen insight and various knowledge, have remained ‘invincibly ignorant.’ The converse of this will be equally true. As little can classical poetry be expected to come home to the popular sympathies of a later age. There will always be exceptions: but how have the exceptions been regarded? What do modern politicians think of enthusiasts who bring from school or college an admiration of the institutions of Greece and Rome? or, how do religious philosophers explain ‘the aversion of men of taste for evangelical religion?’

And should this circumstance, it will be asked, be regretted? Are we, it may be demanded, whose lot has been cast in the fulness of the times, to return to our morning dreams? Should we prefer to the choral vesper chaunt of creation the early and slender trill of a bird but half awakened? Ministered to by the powers of the unseen world, must we wander in retrograde imagination to groves and fountains haunted by divinities which the objectless heart created 'after its own image?' Encompassed with the more excellent glory of an abiding vision, which embraces our sphere of space and time as with a spiritual zodiac, must we search for that herb which opened the eyes of Glaucus, and sigh for the credulities which discerned wonders in every floating cloud or misty rock? Begirt by, nay, a part of, Realities which, if seen in the clear light vouchsafed to the pure in heart, outshine all poetic conceptions, and, if they but loom around us,—re-absorbed into gloom, or half eclipsed by the shadow of our own terrestrial nature,—ought, by their awfulness, to quell the poetic spirit, shall we endeavour, with idle industry, to shut out great things with decorated trifles, and to hide behind a veil of radiant fancies the countenances of Life and Death? What part have we with Gods and Goddesses? What commerce can there be between Paganism and the race of the Baptized?—Far be it from us to make light of the momentous truth involved in such questions. If we abstain from insisting upon it, it is only because such high matter, though allied with, is distinct from our humbler theme, and cannot worthily be illustrated in connexion with it. Moreover, this question also, considered practically and with reference to our subject, has another side to it. It was, indeed, as we have remarked, the indirect influence of Christianity chiefly which, widening and elevating the moral nature of man, introduced into his imagination a spirit antagonistic to Pagan conceptions, and laid the foundation of modern arts and of modern life. So large a change in public sentiment is irrevocable, involving, as it does, the destruction of those associations which are the conductors of popular and poetic sympathies: but it does not follow, we fear, that the continued alienation of popular sympathies from classical themes proceeds from the same high cause by which it was originally produced. The Arts of the Middle Ages soared above Paganism: the Imaginative Mind of modern times stands for the most part aloof from it; but it stands aloof from Christianity also. Secularity is its prevailing character: while, even in Paganism there was a spiritual element. We may not, without a risk of insincerity and presumption, indulge in either an exultation or a regret higher than corresponds with our low position. Can we with truth say that the portion of our modern lite-

rature which reverts to ancient mythology is less religious than the rest? Is it not, in the case of some authors, the only portion which has any relations, even through type or symbol, with religious ideas? In the case of religious poets, is it always the least religious portion of their works? Would Danté, would even Milton, have found more to sympathise with in the average of modern literature than in Homer or in Sophocles, in Wordsworth's 'Laodamia,' or Keats's 'Hymn to 'Pan'? What proportion of our late poetry is Christian either in spirit or in subject,—nay, in traditions and associations? Admirable as much of it is, it is not for its exalted nature, that it can be commended. Commonly it shares the material character of our age, and smells of the earth; at other times, recoiling from the sordid, it flies into the fantastic. As our modern metaphysics, with no character of its own, hunts up the trails of innumerable philosophies gone by, like a dog questing after its master, so our modern poetry has sought wild adventure and strange experience in the spirit rather of the *ennui* than of the knight-errant, but has seldom lighted on any authentic image of the heroic or the religious. It is our life which is to be blamed: our poetry has been but the reflection of that life. The dust of worldly business, like the ashes of worldly pleasures, is not holier in Christian than in Pagan times. It is not the least religious of our poets who exclaims,—

‘I'd rather be

A pagan suckled in a creed outworn,  
So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,  
Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;  
Have sight of Proteus rising o'er the sea,  
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn.’

The sentiment is true, whether in verse or prose. It affirms but that Triton is better than Plutus; that the imagination has more of the spiritual about it than self-interest has; that the shepherd, watching the distant foam from his green pasture, is likely to be greeted with higher visitations than the merchant who hurries to the sea side but to inspect his bill of lading.

Nor can it with truth be asserted that Greek poetry was only an art intended to minister to enjoyment. Nothing with so low an aim would conduce to the permanent enjoyment of a rational and moral being. Founded, as we have observed, on the idea of Justice, and faithfully adhering to the rules of the 'Fit,' Greek poetry might almost claim to have celebrated, if not the 'beauty of holiness,' at least the beauty of virtue; for the beauty which it embodied shone ever in the light of purity, and whatever corrupts or depraves fell from it as raindrops from the myrtle leaf. It revered the affections, (and chiefly the

parental), friendship, the rites of hospitality, the pausing foot of age, the claims of country, the sanctions of religion. In *Andromache* it saw every domestic tie imaged and united in the central bond of marriage; in *Iphigenia* it sacrificed life to duty and a parent's will; in *Antigone* it was faithful to the dead, and revered the unwritten law more than the laws of men. In *Homer* it expanded itself in genial sympathy with all human and social relations: with *Sophocles* and *Pindar* it elevated those relations, musing on a holier sanctuary than *Colonus*, and pointing to an Olympic course of which Gods not men were the spectators. Even in its lighter mood, inspired as might seem simply with the joy of life itself, it was not more the voice of gladness, than, if rightly interpreted, the acclaim of gratitude; singing in the ear of Nature her own ceaseless praises, and thanking her, not amiss, for her liberal grace. Greek poetry could not have included in it so high a character, if Greek theology and Greek philosophy had not contained, implicitly or explicitly, an element of greatness and truth. Such was the fact. The Platonic philosophy was, be it remembered, the chief secondary cause of the diffusion of Christianity, doing for it more than the gift of *Constantine* could ever have done: and if *Plato* expelled the poets from his ideal commonwealth,—a commonwealth very different from that which he would even have attempted to realise,—it was because he himself, the 'greatest fabler of the State,' could tolerate for the discipline of youth no song that *Urania* herself had not inspired. Truth, yet more elevated, lurked under the symbolic veil of Greek theology. It was the father of Inductive philosophy, who, in his 'Wisdom of the Ancients,' set forth the hidden meaning of mythological fable, and asserted that it contained, although but in broken fragments scattered abroad 'like unto the limbs of *Orpheus*,' no small portion of divine truth; thus inheriting at once and vindicating the ancient opinion that the gentile world had not been left wholly without inspiration,—that it was visited by streams, running long under ground, but derived from sacred sources,—that some beams of a better light were refracted, before sunrise, into its murkier air.

Hardly, indeed, could it have been otherwise. If that Fall which depraved the Will, and subverted the order of man's moral being, had left behind it no 'mens divinior,' dimmed, not obliterated, there would have remained no faculty by which the better light, when vouchsafed, could have been recognised, and no hand by which the priceless gift could have been received. That 'mens divinior' is the great inspirer of poetry. True poetry has ever a substratum of Religion in it, either pointing towards a Faith not yet revealed, or surviving a

Faith flourishing with wild luxuriance on the soil in which that Faith has been interred. Poetry is the vital religion of Nature, and as such, though it may walk in devious ways, its eyes, at least, must be raised to something above Nature. Nature itself was the first revelation made to man, and was necessarily made congruous with that higher revelation destined from the first not to supersede, but to redeem, to harmonise, and to complete it. Where, as in Greece, there existed most of that insight which fathoms her secret meanings, and of that creative mind which interprets hints, human intelligence caught most frequent glimpses of that higher system, proportioned to nature as the building is proportioned to the foundation. Such as the heart of man was, such were the songs that lifted it up: and it is as such that they retain a moral significance for all time. We would not indeed 'divide the crown' between Cecilia and old Timotheus; yet we may reflect that the instrument which in later times shook the Christian temples with awe, or thrilled with the secret of a hushed and subdued pathos the sanctuary itself, bore yet in its glorious aspect and manifold organisation, no small analogy to the simple reed-pipe of the Arcadian divinity as well as of the shepherd watching his flock by night.

The analogy between the Greek mythology and the true religion which in interpreting it abolished it, (as Judaism was abolished by its own fulfilment), reminds us of a legend, which may be new to some of our readers, though perhaps not less authentic than many traditions which belong apparently to the same age:—'That voice which, crying aloud unto Thammus, the Greek pilot, (when on the night of our Lord's most bitter passion; he voyaged past the island of Paxo,) bewailed that "the great God Pan is dead," did not more plainly declare the dissolution of Paynim darkness than did the vision of Parmenio, priest of Lycian Apollo, when Polycarp sat yet at Smyrna. For Parmenio, after his conversion, did confess that as, after sacrifice, he slumbered in the temple (which was a wonder of the world), the pillar against which his head leaned, waxed ever taller, and also slenderer as it rose. And, he gazing around, the other pillars waxed in height likewise, and in thinness became as reeds; and many of them stood together for support. And the wall also ascended (as the cloud that riseth past the cliff); and the roof was lifted up; and the stone that stretcheth from pillar to pillar, and the stone that compasseth the building, raised themselves up in arches, like unto the hands of the priest when he lifeth them in prayer, and did sustain the roof. Moreover, the heads of the pillars, adorned with Asian phantasies, did sprout, like the rod of Aaron, and ran along the roof in traceries as a vine. The temple also

‘grew longer than an Egyptian colonnade; and in the walls thereof there opened out great grots and caves, wherein stood in trance, kings, and prophets, and virgins, and martyrs incarnadine with the blood of their passion, and holding, every one, lily or palm. And from the altar went forth thunderings and lightnings which burned to ashes the chaplets and the offerings, and the statue of Oracular Apollo. And by four gates there entered into the temple, from the four corners of the earth, an innumerable company; and with their psalm, which they sang, the temple was shaken as it would ascend into heaven. And Parmenio heard a loud cry of Spirits, which wept in the words of the sad poet, Virgilius Maro (that descended to the Shades), and said, “We truly did build, but not for ourselves:” and another voice answered to them again, and said, “Since God hath destroyed your work.”—For the word ‘destroyed,’ in the last sentence, might not the word ‘assumed’ be substituted, without injury to faith or morals?

ART. V.—1. *Polynesia (Edinburgh Cabinet Library)*. By the Right Reverend M. RUSSELL, LL. D. and D. C. L. Edinburgh: 1842.

2. *A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands*. By the Reverend JOHN WILLIAMS, of the London Missionary Society. London: 1840.

3. *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands*. By JAMES JACKSON JARVES. London: 1843.

4. *Travels in New Zealand*. By ERNST DIEFFENBACH, M. D. London: 1843.

5. *Lawry's Visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands*. London: 1850.

THE Isles of the Pacific, from the Malay peninsula to the western coast of America, are inhabited by two races of human beings,—the one approaching to the negro, in its general physical characteristics, the other more closely allied to the people of the Asiatic Continent. The first is usually called the Papuan or Austral-negro race, the last the Polynesian. Although their languages are mingled, and contain many striking resemblances in certain localities, and may owe their origin to a common parent\*, yet, in their present condition,

\* In Dr. Latham's opinion, the ethnological break between the race common to the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia, and the race of New Guinea, &c., is so distinct, that he supposes the population of

the races are very distinguishable. A line drawn from the most northern island of the Hawaiian group (Kauai, Atooi of Cook) to the most western point of New Zealand, passing to the eastward of the Feejees, will separate the Papuan (to the westward) from the Polynesian tribes. Not that either race will be found in exclusive occupation of any one of the islands. Even in the Marquesas, and perhaps in Easter Island, the most remote from the main seat of the Papuan race, some traces of its presence are discernible; whilst, not only in the Feejees and other islands near the dividing line, but as far to the west as Madagascar, the Polynesian features and tongue may be traced, — many of the permanent characteristics of a country, such as its bays and headlands, having Polynesian names, or names of cognate origin. Nearer to our arbitrary line, however, as, for instance, in the Feejees, the New Hebrides, and New Zealand, the two races will be found in closest contact. On the west side of the line there is a marked predominance of the Papuans, whilst on the east side the prevailing race is essentially Polynesian. In New Zealand, although the flat nose, thick features, and curled hair are common enough, yet the language is purely Polynesian. This language is spoken from the Sandwich Islands to New Zealand, a distance of seventy degrees of latitude, and from Tongatapa to Easter Island, a distance of sixty degrees of longitude, with not more dialectic variance than exists even in the prevailing language of Great Britain.

It is no part of our design to describe minutely this interesting people, still less to treat of their peculiar and evidently very ancient language. The works at the head of this article contain copious information on all that relates to the Polynesian race. We desire only to engage the reader's attention to a few observations respecting what must be deemed at present the most prominent feature in its condition, — that is, its great and still rapid decrease.

---

Polynesia Proper, instead of following the line of geographical continuity from the mainland, to have arrived by way of what he calls Micronesia, from the Philippines by the Carolines to the Navigator's Islands. In answer to the question — 'From what country of Asia did the Polynesians spring?' Sir G. Simpson answers, 'Almost to a moral certainty from some point or points, between the southern extremity of Malacca, and the northern limits of Japan.' (*Journey round the World*; a most interesting book.) Supposing the whole Polynesian race to have so strong a tincture of Malay blood in it as to be properly called Malayo-Polynesian, yet the causes of the superiority of the New Zealand and Sandwich branch over the others, their industrial habits and aptitude for civilisation, will still remain a distinct inquiry.

We do not pretend that the Polynesians alone, of all savage people, exhibit this feature as the actual normal condition of their race. The North American Indians are rapidly vanishing from the face of the earth; but they were, and such as remain still are, a race of hunters, who, continually retiring before the march of colonisation, find their hunting-grounds (their only means of subsistence) continually narrowing. In some cases they made a stand against the intruding race; but their fierce courage and peculiar mode of warfare were no match for the superior resources of the invaders. Every throe of resistance has only hastened their destruction; often in spite of sincere efforts to save on the part of those who found themselves compelled to destroy. Again, the aboriginal inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land, once numerous, have entirely disappeared; and the same race in the other Australian colonies is also fast retiring or passing away. The case of these unfortunate people, however, presents no mystery. It is not too much to say, that extermination was the common rule. Wholesale butcheries are too well authenticated to admit of doubt; and the prevailing conduct of the settlers, free as well as convict, towards them, seems to show that they have been scarcely regarded as human beings.

The Polynesians have been subject to no such violent shocks. They never were hunters, except of their fellow-men; for nearly all the islands are destitute of indigenous mammalia. In the two islands of New Zealand, comprising a surface about equal to that of Great Britain, the only quadruped was the *Kiore*, a small marsupial rat, which has been destroyed by its Norwegian namesake. The Polynesians are, and always have been, systematic cultivators; the New Zealanders, and possibly others of the race, being even aware of the sexual wants of plants.\* Moreover, although they may at times have suffered injury from invasion, their courage and ferocity, under the conduct of their great intelligence, have enabled them to take such vengeance, as was more than sufficient for the prevention of further wrong. It is also worthy of being recorded, to the credit of our countrymen, of those at least who have come into regular contact with them, that for many years past the Polynesians have been the objects of an active benevolence, — often ill-directed, no doubt, but, — remarkable as having generated, we may hope, an entirely new morality in relation to our intercourse with uncivilised races. The British Government, — wherever its authority has been esta-

---

\* They reject the unprolific tubers in planting potatoes, calling them *tane* or males, and they impregnate their gourds and pumpkins with great care.



blished, as in New Zealand, or even where we have only quasi-diplomatic relations, by the residence of a consul, or the occasional visit of a man-of-war,—has exerted all its influence in favour of the native races. This, to use a homely phrase, has set the fashion to the Europeans visiting or dwelling among the Polynesians; and in New Zealand, where colonisation has been regular and systematic, the settlers, even down to the labouring classes, have, from first to last, in spite of a long course of provocation from the natives, exhibited very creditable sympathy and forbearance towards them.

That there are causes which tend to produce the decay, and, unless checked, the final extinction of the aborigines, and which operate alike upon the American Indians, the Australians, and the Polynesians, cannot be disputed. It is, however, capable of proof that the two former races have suffered directly and immediately, in consequence of the general treatment to which they have been subjected; whilst the latter are declining in spite of all possible pains being taken for their preservation. The prominent causes of the extinction of the American Indians, — namely, the narrowing of their hunting ground, and the use or abuse of ardent spirits,—have no place in the instance of the Polynesians; and yet the decrease of the latter is not much less observable than that of the former. In what manner is this to be accounted for? To what extent is it attributable to intercourse with Europeans, or to causes\* existing antecedently to such intercourse? In any case, are the evils of their condition susceptible of remedy, or even of mitigation? or are they so deeply seated in their social constitution — so interwoven with the habits of the natives and Europeans respectively — as to render it probable that the process of extinction will go on more rapidly than that of any remedial measures we may be able to introduce, until all the efforts of the benevolent are proved to have been of no further avail, than to have smoothed the downward path of a doomed race?

These are questions which we cannot hope to answer completely and satisfactorily : our sources of information are at pre-

---

\* In Mr. Saxe Bannister's 'Account of the Changes and Present Condition of the Population of New Zealand' (*Journal of Statistical Society*, Oct. 1838, p. 366.), the following causes of depopulation are quoted from a recent writer:—1. The wars from 1821 to 1830, which were occasioned by Strongi, who visited England. 2. Want of occupation, which prompts war. 3. Superstition, which forbids food being given to the sick, and so kills 'thousands.' 4. Bewitching kills 'thousands.' 5. The degraded state of the women, and polygamy. 6. Suicide. 7. Diseases.—*Polack*.

sent too scanty. Communication with Europeans, and the subversion or weakening of the ancient superstitions of the natives, are too recent, and are still in too transitional a state, to enable us to judge, with any certainty, of their ultimate effects. But we can indicate several particulars, as well in the habits of the natives as in the nature of our intercourse with them, which have operated, and are still operating, in a remarkable manner, upon their condition. And since many of the circumstances, especially those which are most unfavourable, admit of remedy or of mitigation, the subject is not merely a curious one: — the investigation may not be without its use.

The branch of the great Polynesian family with which we are best acquainted is that which inhabits the islands of New Zealand, called in their own language 'Maori,' or pure. The establishment of British authority there, and the progress of colonisation, place within the reach of our countrymen at least one 'blue book' annually, in which information respecting the native race occupies its full proportion. During the administration more particularly of Captain Grey, (now and since November, 1845, Governor of New Zealand,) the most full and minute reports upon the condition of the natives have been communicated to the Government at home; and our intercourse is at present carried on according to a preconcerted and systematic plan, having for its express objects the improvement and preservation of the native race, — by means, principally, of the gradual, but not forcible, substitution of our social institutions and arts of life in the place of their rude, barbarous, and often cruel customs. As an additional reason for drawing our facts and illustrations from New Zealand, it may be proper to state, that the writer of this paper enjoys the advantage of having been himself an eye-witness of much that he sets down. He has not only resided several years in New Zealand, but has been in frequent communication with some of the most zealous and intelligent of the missionaries and others, who have long dwelt, not only among the natives of that colony, but in various other islands of the Polynesian group.

The constantly diminishing number of the New Zealanders is a fact of which every resident in the country becomes sensible; yet it is one which has not yet been verified by any sufficient census. The missionaries, however, have collected from all parts of the country statements of the numbers of the several tribes at different times, and the sum total of these returns has gone on continually decreasing, as our means of correct information have improved. Previous to the establishment of British authority, the aggregate number of the natives was considered to be

near 120,000. In 1840 it was calculated by Dr. Dieffenbach at 114,800. Subsequent accounts have reduced it to 109,000; and it is the general impression of the missionaries, that an accurate census, if now taken, would exhibit a total somewhat, and perhaps even considerably, short of 100,000. Not one of these numbers is to be implicitly relied on; but as our acquaintance with the natives at present is much more advanced than it was ten years ago, the latest number is more likely to approximate to the truth than the earlier ones. It should also be remembered that errors in censuses usually consist of omissions, and not additions. Thus, if the errors be assumed to be greater in 1838 than in 1848, the earlier number would probably have to be increased in a far greater ratio than the last; and the actual decrease will consequently have been greater than the figures, which we have quoted, represent. Figures of this kind are, however, such poor authority, that a diminution in the population may be more safely inferred from the number of abandoned places of abode, or *kaingas*, throughout the country, and from the visible decline of those *pahs* and *kaingas* which come under the traveller's observation, after an interval of a few years, without any equivalent increase by migration elsewhere. The natives themselves are well aware of the falling off of population. They see the English grasses spreading over the fern-hills, unimpaired by the heavy tread of the cattle, which gradually destroys the less useful plants; and they draw analogies unfavourable to the prospects of their race.

In the case of the other islands, any thing approaching to trustworthy numeration is, of course, of even rarer occurrence than in the case of New Zealand. The only statement which pretends to accuracy and particularity is to be found in Jarves's 'Hawaiian History.'

'The following table,' he observes, 'will illustrate, in some degree, the decrease of population since the time of Cook. The census, as collected by the natives, is not much to be relied on, especially those of a few years back. In taking them it was, I suppose, only to get at the taxable polls; and great reluctance and deceit prevailed among the people, which prevented any positive accuracy: still, sufficient facts are established to show the general rate of decrease. Cook's vague estimate in 1779 made the population 400,000; but 300,000 would have been nearer the truth.'

A loose estimate for 1823	-	-	-	142,050
A census in 1832	-	-	-	130,313
A census in 1836	-	-	-	108,579

Jarves, Appendix, p. 373.

'The census of this year (1840),' continues Mr. Jarves, 'is not accurately known; but the population of the group is estimated at upwards of 100,000, of whom 1000 are foreigners, and an equal number of half-breeds.'—*ib.* 376.

According to the works placed at the head of the present paper, a similar falling off in the native population has taken place in most of the islands of the Polynesian group. There may be slight exceptions; but these we need not notice until we come to speak of the future prospects of the race in general.

Even to superficial observers, the most striking peculiarity in the population of New Zealand is the small number of women in proportion to men, and, also, as compared with Europeans, the very great deficiency of children of both sexes. Here, again, we have as yet no complete information, such as would be afforded by a census of the whole people; but we have returns of the population of certain districts between Wellington (Port Nicholson) and New Plymouth, collected by the missionaries; which we believe to be tolerably correct, and which will serve to establish, with sufficient precision, the ordinary proportions of women and children to adult males. These are as follows:—

1843.

	Men.	Women.	Boys.	Gf'ls.
Waikanae - - -	394	235	115	97
Manawata - - -	312	243	141	96
Ranji Ukei - - -	204	148	46	26
Wanganui* - - -	1408	1172	364	299
Taranake - - -	920	645	195	121
	3138	2443	861	639

\* A more careful census of the Wanganui tribes was taken in 1846. The numbers were nearly stationary, as compared with the census of 1843; but the proportion of women had slightly improved. As there were omissions in the census of 1843, and that of 1846 was taken individual by individual, there was probably a real decrease. Since then the outbreak at Wanganui has occurred, a very disastrous event probably for the native race; not that many have been killed in actual warfare, but they have suffered greatly from the privations of war, including scarcity of provisions. The two years' census compared:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
1843 - - -	1772	1471	3243
1846 - - -	1739	1501	3240

		Males.	Females.	Total.
Adults	- - - - -	3138	2443	5581
Children	- - - - -	861	639	1500
		3999	3082	7081

It will be observed that this embraces only a small portion of the population,—about one fourteenth or one fifteenth (comprising the two islands); but it comprises a fair average of circumstances and a variety of localities. The returns are not drawn solely from a coast population, more or less closely in contact with Europeans. They exclude the more vicious and corrupt inhabitants of the towns; but include the population bordering on three rivers which extend far into the interior. A very careful census is now in progress under the guidance of the Bishop of New Zealand. At the commencement of 1848 it had extended over half the northern island, and contained an enumeration—family by family, and individual by individual—of about 40,000 persons. We have been informed that the proportion of the sexes, as nearly as could be ascertained, will be shown to be about 100 men to 80 women; which is rather more favourable than is shown by the above table, and considerably more so, as we shall presently show, than in the town paha. This census, if completed, has not yet reached England.

On the east coast we learn, from the highest authority, that the proportion of males to females is as 100 to 75, and that the number of children is lamentably small. Finally, the writer has himself taken some trouble to investigate the matter whenever he has had opportunity, as well near Wellington as elsewhere; and his impression is, that about 100 men to 75 women is the prevailing proportion. In many small paha and kaingas he has found the ratio as high as two to one.

The population of the town and harbour of Wellington has lately been very carefully ascertained, for the purpose of settling questions of occupation and cultivation between the natives and the New Zealand Company. In the town of Wellington the six or seven paha which existed at the first settlement of Port Nicholson have dwindled to two principal paha, and a small knot of natives at the one pah of Kurun-toto. The other paha mentioned in the following table extend from Wellington to the

---

In 1846 the children are not distinguished. In the case of Kauai, Sir G. Simpson quotes a census, where the disproportion between parents and progeny was so great as 'to leave, perhaps, hardly half a child to 'each couple of those who were classed as men and women.'

mouths of the Eritonga or Hutt. The old pah of Tiakiwai exists no longer as a pah. The spot is used by the natives as a sort of market for pigs, potatoes, fish, and fire-wood, and, to say the truth, for a more reprehensible purpose.

Population of the Harbour of Port Nicholson, January 1. 1847.

Pahs.	Men.	Women.	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
Pitoni - - - -	58	41	14	21	134
Wai-weta - - - -	24	20	10	6	60
Nga Urunga - - - -	25	22	12	9	68
Kai Warra - - - -	31	22	5	2	60
Pipitea - - - -	53	35	11	17	116
Kurun-toto - - - -	8	11	2	2	23
Te Aro - - - -	88	51	19	14	172
Tia ki wai - - - -	no permanent residents.				
	287	202	73	71	633

Proportions - - - 70·4 women to 100 men.

„ - - - 50 children to 100 men.

„ - - - 29 children to 100 adults.

„ - - - 75·8 females of all ages to 100 males.

An excess of males prevails, to a greater or less extent, throughout the Polynesian islands; but detailed accounts are not to be met with.\* The mere fact is mentioned by almost all writers on them from Cook downwards. Cook describes it as a conspicuous evil every where; and in Easter Island—far remote from the usual track of ships, and rarely visited by Europeans—the fact is equally true at the present day. From some personal knowledge of the American Indians, and from the various statements published concerning the Australians, we cannot resist inferring that this inequality of the sexes is a feature common to all savage tribes, among whom the condition of women is very deplorable.

The effect of an excess of males on the aggregate fecundity of a population has not yet, we think, been properly estimated. Even where a high standard of sexual morality is acknowledged, there is always a very great amount of ill-directed indulgence, exercising a considerable effect on fecundity, though not necessarily on population; because the children produced may still be more numerous than can be brought up. If the social state be such that a lawful union soon after the attainment of full age be difficult or inconvenient, there has always hitherto been

\* Mr. Jarves gives a detailed account of the population of Kauai, one of the Sandwich Islands. The numbers are, 4620 males and 4135 females—a ratio of 100 to 88.

found a lax morality in that respect, even among a people otherwise moral. Witness the case of Great Britain itself, where no impediments are in the way of timely marriages from a disproportion between the sexes, but only from the habits of society; which require, in all but the lowest and most reckless, a certain security for the future before the married state is entered upon. But wherever there exists so inseparable a bar to marriage as a large deficiency of women, the probability of unchastity is far greater, with a proportional injury to fecundity. It is a physiological fact, that promiscuous indulgence on the part of the female has a tendency to postpone and impair, and, if carried to excess, to destroy her fruitfulness; and the following generalisation may be suggested as approaching to the certainty of a law of nature.

The number of the males in excess is the expression of the minimum amount of fecundity destroyed: that is to say, a population consisting of 100 males and 80 females will be fruitful, not as might be supposed in the proportion of 80, but only of 60 pairs. It is not necessary to the value of this law, to assert that the fruitfulness of any one female is destroyed, though in practice, no doubt, that of many is so. Assuming the effect to be distributed over the whole population (reducing the general run of families to ~~one~~ <sup>two</sup> children\*), the lowering

\* As we proceed, we cannot refrain from giving two pieces of evidence of the reduced state of fecundity at two opposite points of the Polynesian group. In 'Jarves's Sandwich Islands,' Appendix, p. 373., there is, as we have just said, an exact return of the population of Kauai. It appears that all who have three children are exempt from taxation; and yet very few indeed appear to be so exempt. The island is divided into four districts, and the population is thus classed:—

Taxable men	-	-	-	-	905	490	536	853
„ women	-	-	-	-	732	384	396	701
„ boys	-	-	-	-	75	17	31	34
„ girls	-	-	-	-	45	30	32	34
Boys under 14	-	-	-	-	309	30 <sup>1</sup>	155	353
Girls under 14	-	-	-	-	277	132	154	264
Men having three or more children					25	0	10	33
Women ditto ditto					24	0	10	31
Old men	-	-	-	-	249	75	101	237
Old women	-	-	-	-	294	94	125	279
					2935	1252	1550	2819

<sup>1</sup> So in the original, but probably 130.

of the aggregate sum of fecundity is, in the most favourable circumstances, equivalent to its utter destruction in twenty females and forty males. In other words, if, on the one hand, we assume, not as the fact, but as an approximate measure, the unimpaired fecundity of sixty pairs, we must, on the other hand, reject the remainder (*i. e.* twenty over-matched females and forty over-matching males,) as wholly inoperative in continuing the race. We put this forward only as an empirical rule; fully satisfied, however, that, as such, it may safely be relied on. We can conceive as possible so pure a state of morality, as to set the rule practically aside; or we can conceive the excess of males to be employed in wars among themselves, or in distant wars or distant navigations. On the other hand, circumstances may arise to aggravate the operation of the tendency. But, as a tendency, we are bound to keep it steadily in view, if we would look for the improvement of the native race in the right direction.

The measure which we have suggested of the effect of the tendency, supposes that no licentious habits have been generated beyond what are involved in that gratification which, in spite of morality and missionary teaching, the males who are in excess will always secure to themselves. Suppose the sudden destruction or removal of a part of the women in a community of what we shall call average morality, the effect, previous to the tainting of the whole population with licentious habits, would be such as we have stated. That was our reason for using the phrase 'minimum amount of fecundity destroyed.'

---

So that of a total population of 8556, only 68 couples had more than sufficient descendants to replace themselves.

A census of the pah called Pipitea, in the town of Wellington, taken by the medical officer, Dr. Fitzgerald, in 1847, gives the following results :—

1 married couple with 5 children each pair.			
1	"	3	"
5 <sup>2</sup>	"	2	"
10 couples and widow	1 child		"
10 couples with	0 children.		
27 single men.			
8 single women.			

Thus, in Pipitea pah, there are 28 children to supply the waste of 88 adults !

---

<sup>2</sup> One of these has two wahiné; with this exception polygamy has ceased in this pah. Among 27 couples, 2 only have more than 2 children, and 10 have none.



In such a community, the effect upon population would probably be no greater than is contemplated by Mr. Malthus in the fifth chapter of his first book\* : that is, it would be a mode, but by no means the only mode, by which population would practically be kept down to the means of subsistence. So demoralising, however, is a large excess of males, that it would not exist long without generating habits of licentiousness, calculated to impair fecundity to a far greater extent than our measure expresses:—besides the impediments which it throws in the way of rearing many of the children whose birth it had not prevented. Even an equally matched population may become so licentious as to produce and bring up but few children. The Areoi societies of Tahiti were probably not ill-matched.† Being composed of the highest class, they would secure to themselves a full supply of women. From their licentious lives, they probably did not produce a large proportion of children, and such as were produced were put to death. Out of the pale of the Areoi, in Tahiti, and throughout the whole of the Polynesian islands, until the occurrence of a recent exception, the state of society in point of licentiousness has been without parallel in any other part of the world in modern, and perhaps even in ancient times.‡

All recent accounts show that early licentiousness among the women and female children, though restrained, no doubt, by missionary teaching, is not eradicated even in the fully Christianised islands; while in New Zealand,—as yet but half converted, even if the numbers professing to be Christians be considered such, not one quarter perhaps of whom can be considered Christian, if tried by a more rigid test, — its prevalence is still very great indeed.

\* ‘Of the Checks to Population in the Islands of the South Sea.’

† The best account of the Areoi Society is to be found in Ellis’s ‘Polynesian Researches.’

‡ Every reader conversant with the subject is aware of this fact; and if formal proof be required, we may refer to the very careful and complete summary of authorities given by Mr. Malthus in the chapter already cited. (Vol. i. 4th ed. p. 88.) With his usual sagacity he seeks for ‘powerful checks to population in the habits of the ‘people;’ stating, as the only alternative, ‘unless a perpetual miracle render the women barren.’ Mr. Malthus’s purpose merely required him to show the check by which population was kept down. At an early period, probably, the checks went no further than to keep the population of the fully peopled islands stationary, or nearly so; and it was obviously no part of Mr. Malthus’s plan to show in what manner a set of checks, only sufficient at one period to keep population stationary, may become so aggravated as to promote depopulation.

In many of the islands of the Pacific there have existed, and in New Zealand there still exist, circumstances and habits which directly aggravate the excess of males. The first is the ancient and still prevailing practice of polygamy. Most of the unconverted chiefs of New Zealand, and many of the Rangatira, or upper class, have a plurality of women. Eight is the largest number that we have heard of; three, four, and five are not uncommon, but many have only two (perhaps the principal *wahiné* and her sister). Christianity has checked this, as well as other hurtful practices; but it has only scotched, not killed; and even some chiefs, who, from policy, *profess*, without *feeling* the new faith, may still be seen attended by their women. Of this the well-known Rauperaha may be cited as an instance. The number of professing converts in New Zealand may on the whole exceed one half of the whole population; but the proportion of converted chiefs is rather less than that of the common people (*tutua*) and slaves (*taurekareka*). There is also a collateral consequence of this institution, which greatly aggravates its mischief. A single example will best explain this. Te Heu-Heu, the fine old chief of Taupo, who perished by a landslip in the winter of 1846, with his son, his eight *wahiné*, and a numerous body of his people, had always rejected the overtures of the missionaries with scorn. His son, however, a fine lad, was a Christian; and, had he lived, would no doubt have married only one woman, and have greatly contributed to the civilisation of his tribe. Yet, up to the time of his death, as we have been informed, some four or five of the best connected young girls of the Taupos and kindred tribes were made *tapu*\* (sacred or exclusive) to him. In all probability this *tapu* would not have been taken off during the old man's life — even after the son had married according to the Christian rite. The privilege of *tapuing* a number of females to his future use, in addition to the possession of a number of women or wives, is by native custom vested in every chief. In case any of the women, who have been thus appropriated, break the *tapu*, the penalty is, or may be, death; unless the chief, and perhaps the *tohunga* or priest, be propitiated by a large gift, as '*utu*' (payment or satisfaction) for the offence.

The effect of this custom is to remove, as it were, out of the market precisely those females most likely to have had families; at the same time that it enhances the aggregate excess of males among the great body of the people. Let it be assumed that the wives, and ultimately the *tapu* females, are placed in cir-

---

\* Commonly written *taboo*.

cumstances favourable to breeding; and that they do, in fact, though this is far from being the case, and is most improbable, produce large families: nevertheless, their temporary removal, by diminishing the aggregate supply of families, spreads the operation of the rule above laid down over a larger number; in other words, decreases the proportion of fertile pairs.

To this evil the presence of Europeans, no doubt, adds more or less considerably.\* In all our colonies there is an excess of males. Even with great care to secure equality of the sexes, by aiding the emigration of young married and marriageable couples only, it is impossible to check the voluntary emigration of a much larger proportion of young men. All above the labouring class abstain from marriage until they have acquired some means. If, in order to sustain their position — or, as it often turns out, to sink in the scale of society unseen by their former associates — men above the labouring class determine upon emigration, they shrink from subjecting a wife of their own class to the hardships, difficulties, and uncertainties incidental to establishing themselves in a new country, even when most favourably circumstanced. Again, the whole of the whaling population — the ‘shore parties,’ as they are called — are, almost without exception, single men; or — if sea-faring men, with wives at home —

---

\* According to Count de Strzelecki, the presence of the European acts still more directly in accounting for the gradual disappearance of the native tribes. From his own experience of hundreds of instances, recurring among different races of aborigines, he infers the general fact, — that in all cases of fruitful intercourse between an aboriginal female and a European male, the power of conception on a renewal of intercourse with the male of her own race is lost, and that of procreating with white men only is retained. (*Physical Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land*, p. 347.) This most humane and accomplished traveller must excuse a writer in the ‘Monthly Journal and Retrospect of the Medical Sciences,’ of last October, for treating the inference in question as nothing more than an hypothesis for the present. The late Mr. Sadler had a memorable gift for discovering recondite laws of population. And notwithstanding Captain Larcom's reliance on Mr. Gregg's Social Statistics of the Netherlands, we share Mr. Hallam's surprise at finding that the Report of the Irish Census of 1841 has affirmed the average number of children in an Irish family to be considerably lower than in a Scotch or English one, ‘in accordance with the well-known law, ‘that the most marrying race have the lowest cypher of fecundity.’ (*Journal of Statistical Society*, June, 1844, Sept. 1845.) What would the Chinese say to this well-known law? Not long ago, philosophers accounted for the polygamy of Asia, by supposing that Nature had handsomely accommodated the East with a proportional excess of females.

they are single men in relation to the colony, and to our present purpose.

The European population of New Zealand, according to the census of 1846, was as follows:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
Company's Settlements - - -	4621	3849	8470
Northern Settlements - - -	2616	1888	4504
Whalers, chiefly South - - -	700	"	"
	7937	5737	13,674
Proportion of sexes - - -	100	72.4	

A still later European census, distributed as follows, presents nearly the same proportion:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
New Ulster - - -	4996	3835	8831
New Munster - - -	4911	3966	8877

17,708

The ill consequences of this excess of males do not fall upon the European population,—or, at least, only to a small extent,—but on the natives. A great number of the single men who have spread about the colony as stock-keepers, shepherds, and in other available offices, as well as nearly all the whaling class, have 'Maori wives.' In some cases the connexion is sanctioned by the legal tie; but, in most, it is a 'Maori marriage,' arranged by a bargain with the friends of the woman, cemented by the all-pervading 'utu.' The woman so assigned to the pakeha (or stranger) considers herself his wife, until the tie is dissolved by the will of her lord. She is generally faithful, hard-working, especially useful, and almost invariably cheerful and good-tempered. In many cases the birth of a child induces the father to convert the temporary connexion into a legal marriage. In the middle islands, and in the southern or Stewart's Island,—the coasts of which are frequented by the black whale,—connexions of this nature have given birth to a fine race of half-caste children,—one of the finest in the world; many of whom are now grown up, and are distinguished for their comeliness and beauty. Upon the female part of the European population of New Zealand the effect of this is beneficial. It goes far to absorb and render innocuous the excess of males; and young European women, looking forward to marriage with more certainty than they could have done in England, have a powerful motive to remain chaste. In the towns, open and professed

prostitution is almost confined to native women. But, as far as the natives are concerned, the surplus of males in the European population is exactly so much added to the excess of males among the natives themselves.

The small number of children is the most striking consequence of the deficiency of females, and of the state of morals engendered by such deficiency, aggravated, as we shall soon see, by other circumstances. To understand the full extent of the evil, we must compare the number of children with the number in other countries more favourably situated. For this purpose we have chosen the United States, where population is rapidly increasing; and Ireland, where the rate of increase is now extremely slow. We need not trouble the reader with a confused and tiresome array of statistics, as the sources of information are open to all the world; but shall content ourselves with a table showing proportions only, as also being more favourable to clearness of comprehension.

Classes.	United States.	Ireland.	New Zealand.	
			5 Pahs.	Towns.
Adult males - - - -	100	100	100	100
Adult females to 100 men - - -	98*	108	77	70
Children to 100 men - - -	161	141	48	50

It may be that there are some parts of New Zealand, remote from the towns and coasts, where the proportion of children is higher; but the probability is, that the proportion exhibited by the whole population is not much more satisfactory; for, as we have already observed, the Wanganui and Marrawatu rivers run far into the interior, among tribes having very little contact with Europeans. If the excess of males had worked no ill effects beyond the destruction of fecundity expressed by our empirical law, 100 men and 77 women, being equivalent to 54 fruitful pairs, ought, according to the Irish proportion, to have 78 children. That they have only 48, shows additional causes to be at work.\* Some of these we have already dwelt upon; others will

\* In Ireland there are (or latterly were) 48 children to every 34 pairs of adults. It may be necessary to remark, that these numbers do not express the number of children born to every 100 men (or 200 parents) during their whole lives. If every 200 parents had only 141 children altogether, the race could not be kept up. The number 141 represents the children in existence at any given time, for every 100 men, or 200 adults; which is far short of the total number of children to 100 marriages. At any given time, many of the grown persons in existence have had no children; a majority,

be stated hereafter. In the United States almost every circumstance is, in a high degree, favourable to increase of population. In Ireland, circumstances are not unfavourable to fecundity, but are so to the rearing of children. In the period from which our numbers are taken, the population of Ireland, though not absolutely stationary, was increasing very gradually. In case, then, 141 children to every 100 men be necessary, as above, to keep up the race, and provide for a very small increase, it follows that 50 children must be wholly insufficient to sustain a population of 170 adults; and unless the proportion of children and women be increased, by removing or weakening the existing causes of deficiency, depopulation must go on indefinitely.

It is impossible to say at what period, and under what circumstances, the disproportion in question first originated. The language of the Polynesians, however, shows that they have all migrated from one source; while the dialectic differences are so small, that the epoch of their migrations cannot have been very distant. Now immigration, as we have already observed, is always attended by some excess of males. Our oldest colonies and the United States have not overcome it yet; and perhaps the Polynesians in their present abodes, never had a perfect equality of the sexes. But the deficiency of females in these islands, even if not originally produced, has certainly been maintained, by the degraded state in which the weaker sex has evidently long been held,—a state which is not materially ameliorated at the present day. It may be matter of speculation, therefore, how it happens that the causes, from which we are anticipating the probable extinction of the race, should not have brought it to its termination before this. The most severe and painful labour falls on them. They bear heavy weights, and do nearly all the field work, besides all the work in-doors. They are literally treated as beasts of burden. It is to be feared that the missionaries, having for the most part been struck with the enormity of those grosser practices which they deemed peculiarly sinful, have, in their teaching, neglected other no less essential moralities. Some, however, have devoted themselves, with as much intelligence and thoughtfulness as zeal, to the general improvement of the habits of the natives. Nor is it by hard labour alone that the Polynesian women suffer. For

---

probably, have not yet had half the number they eventually will have; and only a small minority have had their entire number, of whom, too, a proportion have grown up, and are reckoned among adults. Thus the population returns may show only 141 children to 200 adults, when the number of offspring to a marriage may be four or more.

small faults, real or pretended, they are often cruelly beaten, and for graver offences, killed. For example: — ‘About the middle or latter end of June, 1843, one of the wives of a native chief at Kaweranga-on-the-Thames (New Zealand), for some alleged offence, was hung up by the heels, naked, and exposed to the view of the whole tribe. In that state she was most barbarously beaten. This treatment had such an effect upon her that she got hold of a musket loaded with ball, placed the muzzle towards her body, and fired it by placing her toe against the trigger. The ball passed through her lungs, and lodged in her spine. She languished for eight or ten days, and then expired.’

This continued hard labour and this systematic cruelty operate in two ways. The waste of female life is greater than that of male; and not merely is fecundity impaired, but the power of rearing children. Many of the affections to which European women are subject, and which are scarcely deemed diseases, become severe and often fatal maladies among savages. The facility with which savage women bear children is mentioned by many travellers. We believe it to be much over-stated. They are certainly peculiarly liable to various uterine disorders, either produced or aggravated by the hard treatment they suffer, and of course made much more serious by their own ignorance and unskilfulness.

If some evils be chargeable against European contact, they are counterbalanced by much good. Our better example, it may be hoped, is softening the lot of women. Skilful medical management is daily rendering the risk of disaster during pregnancy, as well as at and after child-birth, smaller, and the chances of rearing a larger proportion of the children born much greater. The native women suckle their children for a very long period, and when they feed them, their first food is but ill adapted to the tender organs of infants. Our medical officers at the native hospitals, and the English and American medical men now settled in all directions, are introducing more prudent habits. Filth, the most disgusting and fatal, is giving way to cleanliness; and it often occurs that when the Maori has, by some service, entitled himself to a small present, he asks for soap. It has happened to the writer to shame a New Zealander into relieving his *wahine* from the heavy load at her back; and that, too, against her own sense of propriety, no less than against his: he taking it with a good-humoured laugh, she parting from it with no small apparent reluctance, — with much the sort of feeling as that with which an English wife, in a similar rank, would see her husband darning his own stockings, or washing his own shirt. Time must be allowed for displacing these ‘respectable native prejudices;’

but they are dying out with more rapidity than our English farmers are likely to submit to some of the new contrivances of scientific agriculturists.

Infanticide formerly prevailed in all the Polynesian islands. That it now exists only partially, is owing to European example, and especially to the teaching of the missionaries. If the reader be desirous of perusing a variety of revolting, but not uninteresting details upon this subject, he may consult the works at the head of this article. Tried by the mere principle of the necessary relation between population and the means of subsistence, it may be doubted whether the population of the Polynesian islands would have been greater, *cæteris paribus*, if infanticide had not prevailed. We, however, apprehend that it has had considerable indirect influence, by aggravating the sum of gross licentiousness among the whole population. In most of the islands there does not appear to have been any choice as to the sex of the infants destroyed. In Tahiti the Areoi destroyed all children. A Mr. Stuart, a missionary, affirmed, in 1824, that two thirds of the infants perished by the hands of their parents: and Sir G. Simpson speaks of mothers exchanging children, and suckling pet puppies. In New Zealand, however, there cannot be a doubt that more females than males perished in this manner. The male children were spared to keep up the supply of warriors: the females were destroyed as an incumbrance; and, in some cases, mothers killed their infant daughters to save them from the sufferings incidental to the degradation of their sex. Though in New Zealand the more frequent destruction of female children has helped to aggravate the disproportion of the sexes, yet its operation has been less grievous and less constant than that of the general treatment of women. Hard usage and excessive toil, not suspended during any part of the period of pregnancy, are probably the most powerful causes of the waste of female and infant life among all savage tribes.

Infanticide has wholly ceased in the fully Christianised countries of the Pacific. It is rapidly subsiding in New Zealand; but voluntary abortion, brought on by violent pressure upon the abdomen, still continues. Abortion is resorted to by single women, to avoid the trouble of bringing them up, rather than to hide the scandal of having children; and the necessary manipulation is performed by women who make it a trade. The practice of abortion also impairs, and not unfrequently destroys, the fecundity of the females who have recourse to it. It further promotes licentiousness\* by impunity. Both

---

\* Before marriage, or the permanent connexion which is held equivalent to marriage, chastity is universally disregarded among young



infanticide and abortion have been supposed to spring from the disgrace attendant upon intercourse with Europeans, and especially upon the birth of half-caste children. If this looks like a plausible way of accounting for a revolting fact, we can only answer, that it must have been suggested in England in total ignorance of the habits of the Polynesians. Intercourse with Europeans is not deemed a disgrace except by natives fully imbued with Christian morality; and then the disgrace consists in the act itself, and is not enhanced by difference of race. An unconverted native woman, and many, too, who profess the new *tihanga*, will exhibit with pride their half-caste offspring. And why, according to their morality, should they not? Agreement to live with the man is the only marriage the native woman has ever known, and she is encouraged to live with the European by her parents and relations. Her condition is wonderfully improved in consequence: she has more wholesome food; she is not spurned from the presence of her lord, but shares his meal, his society, and his confidence. She exchanges her tattered mat for European clothing; she is taught to be cleanly, to braid her glossy hair, and adorn her person, until either she appreciates the convenience of the change, or her vanity is flattered by the distinction. She becomes an object of a tenderness she has never before known. She teaches her soft language to her partner, and learns his customs in return. Even the rough whaler is generally kind to the woman with whom he lives; and in not a few instances, as we have said, the temporary connexion is converted into a permanent one. Even where a separation takes place, it is no more than she would have been liable to from a native husband. At this moment, in the Supreme Court of New Zealand, there are cases of native women obtaining probates of the wills, or taking out administration of the effects of their deceased European husbands, and administering, with the advice and assistance of the official administrators, for the benefit of themselves and children.

---

girls, not merely by themselves but by the men. The case in which illicit intercourse may and often does lead to infanticide or voluntary abortion, is where one of a chief's wives becomes pregnant. In such a case she will get rid of the evidence of her irregularity to avoid severe punishment from her lord, but not more so if the partner of her guilt be a Pakeha than if he be a Maori. The greatest disgrace of this kind, and one, therefore, most likely to lead to savage modes of effectual concealment, is, where a woman of the superior class yields to a plebeian (*tutua*) or a slave (*taurekareka*). In such a case discovery is followed by degradation and death, if not from the tomahawk or club of the chief, from the hand of the frail one herself.

On the other hand, were a native girl to refuse the connexion, and so deprive her parent of the customary *uti*, and her quasi feudal lord of his *maritagium*, she would be cruelly beaten, in punishment of her perverseness. It is a curious fact that the parts of New Zealand the most remote from the advantage of missionary teaching, but the most habituated to this species of connexion, — namely, the east coasts of the middle island, — acquired earlier than the north the wants of Europe, — for instance, that of European clothing.\* The natives of that district have made many advances in civilisation by the force of mere imitation. Not that the natives of the Northern Island are at this day comparatively backward. During the administration of Governor Grey they have made great progress. A native police, the habit of working side by side with Europeans on the roads for wages, militia service with Europeans in the late outbreaks, have, it has been said, operated as ‘a normal school for breeches.’ No one can have had any intercourse with the New Zealanders, without being convinced that however much the practice of taking a Maori wife is to be deprecated on religious grounds, it has had, in the early stages of our intercourse, a very beneficial influence on the native character. Its effect is injurious, as far as it aggravates the excess of males; but this is counterbalanced by introducing improved habits, especially cleanliness, neatness, and order; by setting an example to the males of a milder treatment of women; and by generally harmonising the whole population.

In accounting for the present state of the Polynesians, their past wars should not be left out of the account; and, in this respect, there can be no question how much European intercourse has benefited them. War, as it is conducted by Europeans, does not permanently diminish population. Among populous nations, it is doubtful whether it makes even a temporary impression. The casualties of a campaign are soon supplied by the increased number of children reared. Unless where warfare is accompanied by a great destruction of capital, so as to affect productive industry, or by the laying waste of lands, its tendency is rather to stimulate increase of numbers, by keeping down the excess of males. But the wars of the New Zealanders and the Polynesians have had a contrary tendency. In proportion to the small numbers of the people, those wars were frightfully and almost incredibly destructive. In many cases, whole communities — Hapu, or sub-tribes — have been exterminated. A pah

---

\* The comparative coldness of the climate no doubt promoted this. Otago, in 46°, has a harsh climate compared with the Bay of Islands in 35°.

once taken, so long as the infuriated passions of the invaders lasted, the slaughter of the conquered was continued, accompanied by every aggravation that savage nature could devise. Neither age nor sex was spared, unless it were a few of one sex for slavery, and of the other for lust. The traveller along the coast paths of New Zealand continually passes the depopulated paha and cultivations of annihilated tribes. Large tracts of country now deserted, or only sparsely peopled, meet his eye, with the most unequivocal marks of former populousness, and of the manner in which it has disappeared. After the Ngapnis of the Bay of Islands, under E Hongi (or Shungie), obtained muskets, the sanguinary brutality of their first inroads upon the Waikatto tribes would read like fables. In one of their expeditions, they made an attack upon the great Waikatto pah, called Matuke-tuke. The Waikatto had only native weapons, such as clubs, stone axes, and greenstone *meri*, or *patu-patu*. With the superior advantage of fire-arms, which E Hongi had travelled to Sydney, and even to England, to obtain, the pah was captured in a very short time, when an indiscriminate slaughter commenced. Upwards of 2000 were slain; feasts were held daily on the dead bodies; the bones of the slaughtered still whiten the plain; and the ovens (holes in the ground where the flesh is cooked between heated stones) bear witness to the barbarous banquets in which the conquerors indulged. An immense number of slaves were taken, many of whom were killed and eaten on the way back to the Bay of Islands.

If any of its inmates succeed in getting out of a besieged pah, it is the youngest and strongest. So much the worse for their weaker comrades, when the catastrophe arrives. At Puke-rangiora, and other places, a body of young men escaped. Those who were left behind were, for the most part, killed, a few only being spared for slavery. The middle island of New Zealand was probably never very populous; but it was, within the memory of the early traders, much more so than at present. The treacherous and ferocious slaughters by Te Rauperaha are still remembered; and the numerous tribe which he and his Ngatitooa all but exterminated, is now represented by one solitary man.

It is not merely the numbers, the sex, and the tender age of the slaughtered which can convey a true idea of the effect of these wars upon population.\* All the adult males are fighting

---

\* A reference to the pages of Mr. Williams's 'Missionary Enterprises' will afford ample illustration of the destructiveness of the native wars. Speaking of Harvey's Island, Mr. Williams says:— 'I visited it in 1823, intending to place a native teacher there, as I

men; and, if they move or are driven to a distance, they carry their women with them. There is no such division of the people, as to permit production to go on concurrently with war. The invading tribe must, for the most part, subsist on the invaded land. The invaders are sometimes more numerous than the invaded, and always bear a large proportion to them. So long as a *tauu*, or war party, lives on the enemy's country, their own remains untilled. Then follows a deficiency of food, which affects equally the conquerors and the conquered. This, again, falls most heavily on the women; for they eat not in the presence of their lords, nor until these are satisfied. The courtesies which, in Europe, remove the pressure of all casual hardships from the sex least able to bear them, are here absolutely unknown. There is not a single exception in their favour.

Now what has been the influence of European intercourse upon these exterminating wars? In the completely Christianised islands, war is wholly, or almost wholly, at an end. In partially Christianised islands, missionary teaching and European example have reduced its frequency and mitigated its character. In New Zealand it has almost ceased between the natives; and, when carried on at all, is much less bloody. In the late rebellion in New Zealand there was very little cruelty. With one or two exceptions, it was conducted according to the humane forms of European warfare.

The healthiness of a people has an immediate effect on its numbers, especially when it affects the capacity of the female to bear and rear children. On this head our means of information are limited. According to Captain Cook, in 1769, these people enjoyed 'perfect and uninterrupted health:' and Dr. Forster,

---

'expected to find a considerable population; but on learning that by their frequent and exterminating wars they had reduced themselves to about sixty in number, I did not fulfil my intention. Some six or seven years after this, I visited the same island again, and found that this miserable remnant of the former population had fought so frequently and so desperately that the only survivors were five men, three women, and a few children! and at that period there was a contention among them as to who should be king.' (P. 5. *Snow's Cheap Edition*.)

Speaking of *Manke*, one of the same group, he says:—'By an invasion of a large fleet of canoes, laden with warriors from a neighbouring island, three years prior to our arrival the population, previously considerable, was, by the dreadful massacre that ensued, reduced to about 300.' And in *Mitiaro*, 'by famine and invasion, this island has likewise been almost depopulated, there being not 100 people remaining.'

though he was of opinion that they had the venereal disease before we came among them, yet bears witness to their general healthiness. In New Zealand native hospitals have recently been established under the auspices of Governor Grey; and, in a few years, a valuable body of knowledge will be collected. The medical officer of Wellington, Dr. Fitzgerald, has given a table of the diseases which have come under his notice during an experience of five or six years.

There is no doubt of the almost universal prevalence of pulmonary disease. Scrofulous affections of various kinds are also common, and there is a very aggravated skin disease, called *wai-haki-haki*, a sort of scrofulous *scabies*. In a word, the constitution of the New Zealanders is what we should call unsound. The causes assigned by Dr. Fitzgerald are, the wearing blankets as an article of dress; bad houses, admitting thorough draughts of air through all parts; sleeping on the cold damp ground; and bad diet; but these causes, serious as they are, seem scarcely sufficient to have originated of themselves the state of health which we find at present. Strange to say, what we cannot but consider the two most prominent specialties in the physical history of the Maori branch of the great Polynesian family, have been almost entirely overlooked in accounting for the strumous habit of body which is so universal among them.

The Polynesians are essentially an inter-tropical people. Let the reader glance at the irregular triangle which we have designated as the boundary of the race, and he will find that the Maori is the only branch inhabiting the colder portion of the temperate zone. The northernmost point of the Island of Kauai, one of the Sandwich Islands, is in  $22^{\circ} 15' N$ . The southern tropical line encloses the Friendly or Tonga Islands, Rorotonga, Mongaia, and all the smaller Polynesian Islands, except Pitcairn's and Easter Island, and a very few uninhabited rocks. Between these and New Zealand, which lies in the milder portion of the temperate zone, none of the Polynesian race have settled; indeed, there is but little land. Within the above limits a tropical climate is tempered by insular position, and is highly favourable to uncivilised life.

New Zealand, on the other hand, extends from  $35^{\circ} S$ . to  $47^{\circ} S$ ., with a temperature lower and a climate more severe than corresponding latitudes in the northern hemisphere; the difference being sometimes estimated at  $7^{\circ}$ , though this we think excessive.

There is no doubt but that the human frame readily adapts itself to a change of this extent, especially in a few generations. The process of *acclimatising*, as it is called in America, is familiar

to all who have ever had to remove from a temperate to a tropical climate; and there is no reason to believe that the human frame will not sustain as well, or nearly so, the opposite change. But the Maori has brought from the tropics the habits of the tropics. He dresses in a single mat or blanket worn as a robe, and he moves about, in an Irish or a Channel Islands climate, with his feet, legs, and head bare. Until taught better by Europeans, his dwelling was of the tropical form and materials. Its interior is always over-heated by well-fed fires; but he hesitates not to obey the impulse of the moment, and to rush half naked into the cold and damp air of night. If he has lately learned, from his Pakeha brother, to consult, in some degree, the exigencies of climate, and has begun to clothe his head and feet, and to protect his body, these changes are as yet far too recent to have accomplished any ascertainable amendment in the constitution of the race. This constitution, in its present unsoundness, may fairly be attributed to habitual neglect of the most necessary precautions, especially in a people of their descent.

The other dominant fact, calculated, as we believe, to exercise an unfavourable effect on the human constitution, wherever it is practised, is cannibalism. We throw this out, however, as a suggestion merely. The universal prevalence and dreadful extent of cannibalism among the New Zealanders, up to a very recent period\*, is well known. In some other of the Polynesian group it still exists unchecked. Mr. Lawry, superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in New Zealand, gives a shocking account of the consumption of human flesh in the Feejee Islands. In the missionary notices of last November, Mr. Lyth records, that Ravatu, one of the principal chiefs of Rakiraki, showed him, about a mile out of the town, a row of stones, by which his father had kept count of the number of prisoners his father himself had eaten. They amounted to eight hundred and seventy-two! Cannibalism may have originated as a superstitious rite; but in a country without animals it will also have been practised for a meal—from a desire or a necessity which, by the way, seems to account for the frequency of capital punishments in many such cases as would otherwise have been satisfied by a far lighter penalty. The feeding upon human flesh from generation to generation, a usage so contrary to the general laws of the animal economy, must be regarded as unfavourable to health; and the New Zealanders have fed in-and-in, as well as bred in-and-in†, for generations.

---

\* The last known case was in 1844.

† For the purpose of perpetuating the blood of a family, or in obedience to some other custom, or perhaps merely to satisfy inclina-

It is not to be denied that communication with Europeans, in the miscellaneous way in which in its first stages it takes place, is injurious, but in a far less degree than is ordinarily supposed. The abuse of ardent spirits, European diseases, and European weapons, are generally mentioned as the three great inflictions. With regard to drunkenness, it is a singular distinction, that it has not spread to any very mischievous extent among the Polynesians. They are much in the condition of Englishmen in this respect: drunkards are occasionally to be found; but they are an inconsiderable exception, when compared with the whole people. The New Zealanders are so free from the vice, that such as practise it (Heki in the north, and Rangiharata in the south, for instance) are a bye-word and a reproach; they are pronounced *porangi*—foolish, or deranged. By ‘European diseases,’ syphilitic are no doubt meant. In the early periods of irregular European intercourse, the Polynesians undoubtedly suffered from disorders of this class; but in New Zealand, since the epoch of regular colonisation, with its attendant medical skill, they have ceased to prevail to any such degree as to require particular notice. The writer has made inquiries among the medical men best acquainted with the sanitary state of the Maori population; and the statement we have made is founded upon their testimony.\*

As to arms and gunpowder, they tend to increase the decisiveness but to abate the ferocity of war. As in E Hongi’s case, they gave the first possessors enormous advantages; but when those advantages became equalised, we believe the consequence to have been beneficial. The use of the musket does not excite the vindictive passions like a hand-to-hand encounter. Allowing,

---

tion, what we call incestuous unions were formerly not uncommon. The brother sometimes took his own sister to wife.

\* It is singular that all countries give to these affections names charging them upon some other nation. We call them emphatically ‘French;’ the French speak of them as *Anglaises*. The Portuguese charge them upon the South American Indians; who, in their turn, attribute them to the stranger. The probability is, that the first time a disorder is observed and recorded is not the date of its origin. What did Persius mean, in his Third Satire, by these lines?—

‘Tentemus fauces: tenero latet ulcus in ore  
Putre, quod haud deceat plebeiâ radere betâ.’

(*Sat.* iii. line 115.)

Read in connexion with the whole satire, they afford ground for doubting the modern origin of these disorders; and the disorders appear to be of a nature which might spring up among any people without being traceable to intermediate contact with some other.

However, the full force of these evils, and our responsibility for them, can any one peruse the accounts of the vices of the prior social state of the Polynesians, and doubt that, on the whole, our teaching and example have done good? Where now are their Arooi Societies?—their human sacrifices?—their infanticide?—their exterminating wars?—their cannibalism? All but extinct. We have taught them, and are daily teaching them, the use of wholesome food and of warm and healthy clothing, the practice of cleanliness, a taste for household comforts, and, above all, sundry modes of increasing the means of subsistence by well-applied industry. And as regards the evils which inevitably attach to intercourse with us, the means of mitigating them have been generally introduced, more or less, together with the evils. It is in this respect, that irregular colonisation contrasts most strongly and most unfavourably with that which is pursued on system. In those islands where colonisation is abandoned to runaway sailors, escaped convicts, not over-scrupulous traders, and zealous but not always very enlightened missionaries, the prospects of the native race are less promising than where the social state is well organised, and an orderly government established from the first, as in New Zealand. But, if even this has hitherto been only a difference in degree, what a responsibility does it leave with us! Henceforth communication in one form or another is inevitable. This indisputable fact should be our starting point; and ill-informed indeed must be the persons who, for the sake of the aborigines, would desire that even systematic colonisation should be discouraged.

Whether the downward tendency of the Polynesian race will be stopped by the improved habits which they are certainly and rapidly acquiring, is more than human foresight can determine. This much, however, we are entitled to assert: this desirable end can never be accomplished but on one condition,—that of softening the lot and improving the condition of the women; so as gradually to equalise the proportion of the sexes, and increase the number of children born and reared. In the Tonga Islands the decline of the population is said to have been arrested: and it is remarkable that the manners of the people were always milder there than in the other islands, and the treatment of the women more humane.

The sketch we have attempted to draw does not pretend to be complete, even as a picture of the country with which we are best acquainted. Meantime, it must be obvious that in order to act with advantage, it is necessary to know the mischiefs against which we have to fight. Such social evils, as tend to



promote and keep up the inequality of the sexes should, in the first place, be carefully ascertained and classed: and the more exhaustive the list, we shall be so much the better qualified for applying whatever remedial powers are in our hands. Denunciations against the blanket, and diatribes against tobacco, are not wholly without use; but they keep out of view the principal grievance. Let this once be well understood, and there is scarcely a settler, howsoever humble his position, who may not, through his intercourse with the natives, contribute to the meliorating process. In spite of aggressions by the natives in New Zealand—which have certainly been most trying to the forbearance of the English colonists—the settlers in immediate contact with them are living among them upon terms highly favourable to their improvement. To the eye, indeed, a visible improvement in outward appearance is going on, though it is impossible as yet to say how far it is acting upon the master mischief. Decreasing numbers, however, may be coincident awhile with real and steady progress; since nothing is more common than for the effects of a pernicious system to continue for some time after a more healthy epoch has commenced.

New Zealand enjoys a very large proportion of settlers of a superior class, whose orderly lives and well-regulated habits cannot fail to make an impression on their imitative neighbours. It is on this teaching by example that our main dependence must be placed. Still, considering the magnitude and nature of the obstacles to be overcome, to anticipate their immediate removal is almost to hope against hope. A very considerable decrease will probably take place among the Maori population, and in other islands similarly circumstanced, before the turning point can be reached. But even if it be never reached—if the decaying tendency should never be effectually checked, such of the British people as live in contact with them will have, at least, the consolation of knowing that the native race will have become lost to the world by a gradual process of extinction, not by extermination; and that the last years of their existence as a people will have been passed in comfort and in peace.

Another solution of this embarrassing problem yet remains: perhaps more probable than the direct civilisation of the natives, and certainly far less painful than their extinction,—we mean their amalgamation with their European guests: Until at last there shall be only one family in the land—children of the soil—representing in lineal succession the New Zealander by descent and the New Zealander by adoption. The Maori may disappear, only to rise again in a nobler form. And this is a consummation to which both statesman and missionary are evidently looking.

Sir George Grey, in one of his last despatches (July 9. 1849), observes, that a class of settlements, so constructed; 'might easily grow into prosperous communities, into which the natives, — with characters softened by Christianity, civilisation, and a taste for previously unknown luxuries, — would readily be absorbed.' Mr. Lawry, the New Zealand Missionary, is still more explicit: 'The preservation of any one of the families of the extensive Polynesian nation in their distinct and present form, seems to me unlikely. . . . The expectations entertained in England are by no means realised on the spot. . . . I am of opinion that the probable working out of the problem will be this . . . that the tide of emigration will, sooner or later, flow to their shores, and that a fine new race of civilised mixed people will cover this part of the earth. . . . In many parts of New Zealand the natives are melting away; but they are not lost, they are merging into another and a better class. In this process there lacketh not sin; but Providence will overrule even this, and bring forth an order of things, which shall be better for the world, better for the Church, and better for the new race.'

---

ART. VI. — 1. *An Examination of some prevailing Opinions on the Subject of Taxation in this and other Countries.* By GEO. WARDE NORMAN, Esq. London: 1850.

2. *Rapport Général, présenté par M. Thiers au nom de la Commission de l'Assistance Publique.* Paris: 1850.

3. *Latter-day Pamphlets. No. I.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. London: 1850.

'THE accumulation of capital, the result of an excess of income over expenditure, is the normal state of England,' observes Mr. Norman, in the admirable tract of which the title is prefixed to this article. We believe his assertion to be undeniable; though chiefly applicable, during the last year, to capital engaged in commercial and manufacturing industry. It is true that, on a longer retrospect, agricultural capital has likewise been profitable. The enhanced value of real property cannot be controverted, even by the most determined protectionist. Nevertheless, large fortunes are seldom realised by working farmers. The homesteads of Norfolk and of Northumberland have not, as yet, produced the wealth of the Peels and Arkwrights. The reason of this is obvious. The merchant and manufacturer are forced to move onwards, and to move quickly.

Skill and intellect, the successful application of art, the careful analysis of science, are more requisite, are allowed a fuller developement, and receive a richer reward in commercial than in agricultural pursuits. The steam-engine, from its first action in cleansing the cotton, through all its subsequent operations, till it moves the power-loom and packs the bales for export, increases the value of the raw material in a far greater proportion than has ever yet been realised between the newly-sown wheat-field and the baker's oven. There is still less scope for ingenuity in passing from the fattening stall to the butchers' shambles, from the milking byre to the cheese-merchant's warehouse. We are far from suggesting that the same causes which add value to the raw materials used in manufactories—to silk, wool, cotton, and the metals—do not, though in a very different degree, contribute to the success of British farming. Kirwan, Davy, and Liebig have shown the intimate connexion between the tests and experiments of the laboratory and the operations of improved cultivation; and the successive shows of the Royal Agricultural Society prove that mechanism is likewise doing there its useful work. Smith of Deanston, and Parkes, as draining engineers, have taken their just place among those who may well be termed benefactors. But the original machine and the first elements of fertility, the soil and the atmosphere, do not possess, or at least have not yet shown, the same facilities for promoting accumulation, as Manchester, Leeds, and Derby. Holkham and Woburn have not produced the augmenting fortunes to their owners which have been realised in our sea-ports, our mills, and mines.

The complicated causes which influence foreign commerce, the principles which govern our banking system,—all that pertains to the creation and distribution of wealth,—are brought more immediately under the notice of the British merchant, and stimulate his acquisition of knowledge. The sphere of the farmer is far more limited: his duties are necessarily more confined, and less varied. His hands may be more laborious, but his mind is less active. Hence also it is that we find among our mercantile rather than among our agricultural classes, the men who have contributed the most to the enlargement of our intellectual capital. The Greshams and the Childs of our earlier history have had eminent representatives in later times. Of the distinguished class to which we allude, perhaps the late Henry Thornton may be taken as the brightest example. Wise and practical in his professional pursuits, he combined with these a knowledge and industry which enabled him, as an author, to explain and recommend many important principles of economical science, and, as a member of the legislature, to defend and

apply them. His character was completed by the most active benevolence and the most exalted Christian principles. Mr. Henry Thornton's life still remains to be written; and his tracts should be collected and republished, for the instruction and the example of his countrymen. The late Mr. Ricardo also made the counting-house and the Stock Exchange tributary to his philosophical inquiries; adding to our knowledge by his valuable works, and displaying likewise a rare faculty of explaining abstract truths with clearness and precision, to a reluctant audience, whose understandings he must often have convinced, even when he might fail to influence their votes. Mr. Tooke, to whom we owe the memorable Petition from the Bankers and Merchants of London, has compiled, and illustrated in his 'History of Prices,' a series of facts for the guidance, not only of his contemporaries, but of all future generations. Lord Overstone, better known to our readers as Mr. Jones Loyd, is another striking example. His pamphlets on the Currency founded a school, and laid the basis of Sir Robert Peel's Banking Act of 1844. Without pausing to examine whether this theory is in all respects sound, it is admitted by all parties that the power with which the theory was recommended by its author was of a very high order; and to those who are familiar with the eloquence with which Lord Overstone can discuss and explain questions of economical science, it is undoubtedly a source of high gratification that his eminent abilities are, by the judicious favour of his sovereign, raised to a sphere where he will be enabled to add to the obligations he has already conferred upon the public.

Among the men we have named, Mr. George Norman, the author of the Treatise on Taxation now before us, is entitled to take a most distinguished place. In his position as a director of the Bank of England, also as an able writer on economical subjects, and more especially as a witness before parliamentary committees, he has acquired a high and well-deserved reputation. His writings and his evidence exhibit the accuracy of science without the pedantry by which science is sometimes disfigured. He states and argues, rather than dogmatizes; he collects and furnishes the elements for judgment, and pursues his analysis clearly and accurately, without the least taint of intolerance or over-confidence. He betrays neither irresolution to support, nor readiness to compromise his own opinions, whilst his admirable candour and the ready consideration which he gives to the opinions of others, make him one of the safest, and most faithful, investigators of truth.

In his selection of the subject of this essay, and in his selection

of the present time for its publication, he has conferred upon us a double favour. The subject is important and interesting; it is ably treated; and at this precise moment its practical usefulness is greatly enhanced, because the arguments tend to refute many of the plausible but most dangerous fallacies which, as he himself well expresses it, 'form the stock in trade of the popular orators.' In the mansion which Mr. Norman still occupies, an ancestor of his formerly resided, a close neighbour to the great Lord Chatham. A house clock, with a loud bell, in the days of Lord Chatham, as at the present time, announces the hours to the whole neighbourhood. Tradition ascribes to Lord Chatham the saying, 'I set my watch by Mr. Norman's clock;' we very earnestly hope, in reference to the pamphlet before us, that many of our public men may, in this respect, adopt the practice of Lord Chatham. We have more confidence in the old clock at Bromley than in the modern works ordered for Mr. Barry's tower in the Houses of Parliament, or in those which measure time for the financial reformers of Manchester and Liverpool.

Mr. Norman most truly states that the three following propositions are repeated so often, and with such boldness, as to be received by many as undeniable, and almost as self-evident truths; and yet that on investigation each of them will appear contrary to the real fact, or at least resting on authority more than questionable. The three propositions are:—

1. That the amount of our public expenditure constitutes the great evil of our government, and seriously checks our national prosperity.
2. That our expenditure and our taxation exceed those of other large civilised countries.
3. That in comparison with such other countries, our government is wasteful and prodigal in its expenditure.

It may on first thoughts appear strange that, if these denunciations of evil are untrue, they should be so readily credited. This credulity may easily be accounted for. An Englishman is essentially, not only a cooking and a tailoring animal, according to the definition of man given by some philosophers, but in his special Anglican capacity, he is pre-eminently a grumbling animal. We go further: we believe that this grumbling habit, and the feelings from which it proceeds, are among the active causes of his progressive improvement. Discontented with his condition, he seeks to improve it. Finding fault with the constitution of his country, he vigorously but wisely reforms it. He quarrels with his house, and he rebuilds it in a better site and on a more commodious scale. The excellent Count Strzelecki observed, in his evidence before the Lords,

'the Irish soon improve in the colonies; they become quite as 'grumbling as the English themselves.' This observation displays a true knowledge of the national character. We love to believe that we are, on the verge of ruin; and we readily attribute our supposed ruin to the legislature, or, to the government of the day. At a period also, when the ordinary causes of political excitement are fortunately, in great measure, wanting,—when no Waterloo is to be won by land, no Trafalgar at sea; when the Reform Bill has been carried, and the Corn Laws are repealed; when no one, but Mr. Wyse, 'ful-mines over Greece;' and when we have no public men who will take the trouble of 'fluttering the Volscians,' or any other class, at Corioli, or elsewhere,—the cry of national ruin is convenient to raise, and easy to propagate. He who proclaims it with the greatest audacity, 'is well aware,' as Mr. Norman observes, 'that he is touching a chord which vibrates in the 'national heart, and he scarcely attempts to prove that which 'no one thinks of denying.'

This ruling passion is so strong that not even the most obvious motives of self-interest will check it. A protectionist landlord takes all possible pains to persuade his tenant farmers that the cultivation of the land is profitless, and leaves no surplus. The inference follows of course—all payment of rents has become impossible. Nevertheless, he is astonished to be taken at his word, and to be truly 'hoisted with his own petard.' Some of our protectionist merchants would fain have us believe that they are trading to an absolute loss, and that, 'par raison demonstrative,' their names ought to appear in the Gazette. Our shipowners, even when they are extending their orders, and are laying new ships on the stocks, repeat their cries of alarm at the effects of Baltic competition. But such 'groans of the Britons' are, comparatively speaking, feeble, as only affecting particular classes. The cry against general taxation is, on the contrary, louder: And as it addresses itself to the whole community, it finds an appropriate echo. The belief that we are the most oppressed, worst used, and worst governed nation upon earth,—whilst it would be denied and resented as an insult, if expressed by a foreigner,—is adopted as an article of national faith, around our own hearths, at our public meetings, and in our Houses of Parliament.

In our number for April, 1849 (Financial Prospects), we endeavoured to refute some parts of this fallacy. Mr. Norman carries the reasoning further, and by instituting a comparison between the financial condition of England and that of the principal States of Europe, he adds to the point and force of his argument, and to the importance of his conclusions. It is

undoubtedly singular that we should be so mightily oppressed by taxation, when it is remembered that from the peace to the end of 1845 we have been enabled to remit annual taxes to the amount of 37,000,000*l.*;—a sum exceeding by 18,000,000*l.* the total amount of revenue received in the year 1792, the favourite standard of our most popular economists. This amount of repealed taxation exceeds, by more than 22,000,000*l.*, the whole revenue of Austria. It exceeds, by 17,000,000*l.*, the revenue of Russia, and by 27,000,000*l.* the revenue of the United States. It is about equal to the collective revenue of Prussia, Holland, Belgium, Bavaria, and the Peninsula. We quote from Mr. Porter's tables. The answer given by the man of learning to his presumptuous antagonist, 'I have forgotten more than ever you knew,' may well be parodied by Great Britain, in reply to this comparison with the nations of the Continent,—seeing that within twenty years we have repealed a larger amount of taxation than their governments have been able to collect.

Mr. Norman adopts certain opinions respecting taxation which we consider doubtful, though he supports them by reference to very eminent authorities. We doubt, however, when the whole scope of Mr. Mill's remarks on taxation are fully considered, whether Mr. Norman is entitled, in so unqualified a manner, to use him as one of his witnesses. It is true, indeed, that Mr. Mill states, in his work on Political Economy, that 'the whole of our public expenses may be said to be defrayed out of our overflows, and our wealth is probably as great as if we had no taxes at all.' And Mr. M'Culloch, also, in the same spirit, observes, 'that but for the contests in which we have been engaged since the Revolution, the greater part of the wealth expended in carrying them on would never have existed.' The first branch of Mr. Mill's assertion, if it only implies that our taxes are paid out of income, and not out of capital, merely affirms that we have not based our finances on confiscation, at least in Great Britain; and that our taxation is not regulated by the principles which have governed the treasury of the Railway King. But he and Mr. M'Culloch go further: they both suggest the necessity of paying taxes stimulates industry and thus encourages production. 'Taxes,' says Mr. Mill, 'subtract from the means, not of production but of enjoyment; since what is spent in taxes would, if it were not taken for that purpose, be employed in gratifying some want or taste which at present remains ungratified.' This, in one sense, may be admitted: on the other hand, surely the gratification of those wants and tastes furnishes the strongest and most natural motives to industry. And among those tastes there will always be found

in England, and perhaps found mainly among the industrious classes, a desire of improving their condition by extending their transactions. Let us suppose that 5000*l.* are subtracted, as income tax, from the profits of a manufacturing firm. Surely there is a probability, amounting almost to a certainty, that, had there been no income tax, a large portion of this 'overflowing' would have been converted into capital, employed in extending the mill, in improving the machinery, or in otherwise augmenting the manufacturing stock. Can it be believed that a forcible diversion of capital to the purposes of the State will ever furnish so effectual a motive to exertion as the unrestricted power of applying the same sum at the free option of the party who has earned it? The whole hypothesis against which we contend rests upon a doctrine lately adopted, and too implicitly relied on — the supposed beneficial effects of artificial stimuli or goads. We are so heterodox and old-fashioned, as to kick against these pricks. The reasoning seems to originate in the misapplication of an undeniable truth. We fully admit that a protection granted to any class, even independently of its injustice to the consumer, fails, in the long run, to benefit the class protected. It is too much relied upon by the protected class. Torpor and sluggishness inevitably follow; as is the case even in most under-rented farms. Capital, also, is unnaturally attracted into the favoured line of industry, and a forced competition soon destroys the protection. The withdrawal of such protection is consequently called for, and is beneficial. But because the repeal of a bounty may be beneficial, it is far from a logical inference that the imposition of a tax will have the same effect. It may be right to cease administering a stimulant; it does not follow that we ought to draw blood. No Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether protectionist or free-trader, is likely, for the remote and paradoxical expectation of encouraging domestic industry, to propose doubling the property tax. No one but Mr. D'Israeli has given currency to a doctrine like this. We must therefore continue to consider taxes as *mala in se*, and to trust to the producer as a better accumulator and distributor of wealth than the exciseman. Even supposing this proposition to be defensible, it can only be admitted, that taxes may be regarded as stimulants to production, within certain limitations. We hardly feel called on to deal seriously with the statement that our war expenditure, during the last 150 years, can have been the cause of creating an equal amount of national wealth. This violent exaggeration rests on the supposition that the expenditure of the State is as profitable as the expenditure of individuals. In our times, the State does not reinvest much



of its surplus profitably. But the surplus income of individuals is, to a very considerable extent, productively reinvested. There is thus an increasing income produced in the one case, which is lost in the other. Going beyond this, the pressure of taxation on the payer is scarcely ever to be measured by the amount paid into the Exchequer. In the first place, we should add the whole expense of collection. In the second, we should also add the increased charge which Excise regulations cast upon the cost of production; and in the case of Custom duties, we must charge the interest on the duty advanced by the importing merchant, and necessarily carried forward with still increasing interest every time the commodity changes hands, till it finally reaches the consumer. A third inconvenience is created by the necessity of paying a tax not at the time most convenient, or when profits arise, but at the period fixed despotically by law. These observations are obvious, and have often been made; but, if true, they seem to refute the doctrine with which we have been called upon to deal.

But as we have already said, the doctrine, if true at all, can only be true within strict limits. Where any taxation, general or local, trenching upon capital, leads to the exhaustion of the stock,—as in some parts of the distressed unions in Ireland,—it cannot be questioned but that such grievous exactions must destroy, not stimulate industry. With sincere respect for the authorities to which Mr. Norman refers, we must therefore reject their doctrines, or at least must require far more accurate limitations to them than have been yet assigned them.

We are enabled to claim as authorities on our side Mr. Porter, and the facts which he has collected (*'Progress of the People,'* p. 477.) During the nine years ending with the peace of Amiens, taxes to the amount of 280,000,000*l.* had been levied from the people. Mr. Porter observes that many important interests were then in a state of apparent prosperity; but he adds, most truly,—*'That this was no more than delusion, will be at once apparent to all who examine below the surface, and who inquire into the state of poverty and wretchedness into which the great mass of the people were then plunged. There had been some advance of wages, but to the skilled artizan only, and incommensurate to the cost of the necessaries of life. The mere labourer did not participate even in this partial compensation. Nor could it well be otherwise. The demand for labour can only augment with the increase of capital destined for the payment of wages; and that capital, so far from being allowed to accumulate, was dissipated by the government expenditure more rapidly than it could be accumulated by individuals.'* (P. 478.)

In these latter observations Mr. Norman fully agrees, as (p. 10.) he states, most clearly and emphatically, that if 'the expenditure of the State added to that of individuals exceed the national income, the aggregate capital—the fund destined for reproduction and for the permanent supply of the industrious classes of society—will be lessened.' We have already hinted that we cannot but think that Mr. Mill's high authority is claimed by Mr. Norman on insufficient grounds. 'The sources of prosperity may, as *some think*, be increased by the extra exertion made in our own country to compensate for the pressure of the taxes.' Such is Mr. Mill's very cautious statement. (Pol. Econ. ii. p. 440.) But he proceeds further, and adds, 'Taxes which fall on profits, even though that kind of income may not pay more than its just share, necessarily diminish the motive to any saving except that made for investment in foreign countries where profits are higher.' (P. 441.)

There is a mode of reasoning, or rather a test of progress, adopted by Mr. Norman more than once, from which we likewise dissent. We do this the more freely, because in this argument Mr. Norman seems to differ from himself. We reject altogether any estimate formed of the pressure of taxation by dividing the taxation arithmetically among the population, and producing a return of what is paid 'per capita.' We do not escape from this fallacy, even if it is granted that the proportion between the given amount of capital and the population is unchanged. The taxation of the poor district of Bethnal Green may represent a charge of 20s. a-head, and that of Lombard Street a charge of 100l.; and yet the lesser sum may be felt by the tax-payer as the heavier burden.

The standard which is thus shown to be fallacious, as applicable to space, is equally delusive in regard to time. It fails as between one country and another. It fails also, if we compare two different periods. It is neither to be depended on absolutely nor relatively. This Mr. Norman fully admits when he tells us that 'the Englishman, or Anglo-American, may, without inconvenience, contribute one pound to the national exchequer, when a Siamese, or an inhabitant of Madagascar, cannot pay even one shilling.' Yet we are surprised to find in several subsequent passages that he relies too much upon the very principle which he had previously discarded. The same fallacious mode of reasoning is adopted by Mr. Porter in the important, though, on this account, inconclusive table which he has compiled on the relative expenditure of European countries. Surely, the most correct mode of calculating the pressure of a public burden must seem to be,—to find the proportion existing between the

tax levied and the property on which it is charged. This calculation is difficult from a want of the proper elements. Even if attained it is liable to disturbance, according as property is distributed and as taxation is apportioned. The same amount levied by a capitation tax, or by a graduated property tax, will have very different effects; and the distribution of property appears to us almost as essential a condition of the problem as its total amount.

We now proceed to a part of our duty, which is more gratifying to ourselves than that in which we have been engaged; and, we hope, more gratifying likewise to our readers. We shall bring before them some of the important facts which Mr. Norman has collected, the able arguments which he has deduced from them, and the interesting and practical observations with which he concludes. Accuracy of statement, closeness of reasoning, and sympathy for his fellow men, are discoverable, rather than displayed, throughout the essay.

Does the existing taxation of England, Mr. Norman asks, seriously impede the progress of national prosperity, so far as prosperity depends on the increase of national wealth? The solution of this question will, to a very considerable extent, depend upon the fact,—whether, in times past, and when the amount of taxation was infinitely greater than at present, our national wealth was or was not progressive, or whether, if progressive, it advanced with greater or less rapidity. We believe, however, that Mr. Norman's conclusions are accurate in all that is essential, and are fairly deducible from the facts which he has collected.

The increase of the population since the peace Mr. Norman states, as being from 19 to 28. For the purposes of his argument we adopt his figures, and proceed to consider the evidence by which he proves, to our minds conclusively, how great has been the progress of our national resources.

The declared value of domestic produce exported in 1814 amounted to 45,494,000*l.*, from which if 20 per cent. is deducted for the depreciation of the currency at that period, the real value may be taken at 36,000,000*l.* In 1844 it had risen to 58,000,000*l.* The revolutionary movements of the Continent had in 1848 greatly reduced the powers of consumption abroad, and our trade naturally fell off, showing a decline to 53,300,000*l.* But in the year 1849, Mr. Norman estimates our exports at no less a sum than 60,000,000*l.*, — an amount which, however, has not been fully reached, as appears by accounts subsequently laid before Parliament, showing a declared value of 58,848,000*l.* only.

This, it should be remembered, is the real or declared value;

the official value of our exports, that which measures quantity, not price, and which is stronger evidence of the labour employed, has increased from 34,207,000*l.* in 1814, to 132,617,000*l.* in 1848, or nearly four-fold.

The number of our registered vessels and their tonnage has increased from 24,418, with a tonnage of 2,616,000, in 1814, to 33,672 and 4,052,000 in 1848.

The capital stock subject to legacy duty gives a fair index of the progress of personal property, and is calculated at 24,500,000*l.* in 1814, after deducting 10 per cent. for depreciation. In 1845 the same capital had augmented by more than 20,000,000*l.*,—exceeding 45,000,000*l.*; in 1848 it amounted to 47,462,757*l.*

We do not rely on the estimated value of personal property given by Mr. Porter as considerably exceeding 1,000,000,000*l.* This does not rest on actual proof. Nor do we require its aid in support of our argument, though we accept it as a strong probability, and by no means likely to exceed the truth.

The returns made under the property tax and the poor's rate valuations afford more certain data in relation to the real property of England. In Sir George Grey's admirable speech, in reply to Mr. D'Israeli, in the present session, the following statement was made, which supports the arguments of Mr. Norman, and the figures of Mr. Porter:—

					Value of rateable Property.
1813	-	-	-	-	£51,000,000
1842, 1843, 1844	-	-	-	-	85,000,000
1845	-	-	-	-	86,000,000
1846	-	-	-	-	88,000,000
1847	-	-	-	-	89,000,000
1848	-	-	-	-	91,000,000

It is true that property is in later years rated more closely than formerly, and some allowance should be made for the change. This would not vary the result materially; for the increase shown of no less than 40,000,000*l.* annual rental, is without making any deduction for the depreciation of the currency, in 1813, which may fairly be estimated at 20 per cent. This deduction would be far more than an equivalent for the closer and more accurate valuations of the later years.

However unquestionable the inferences to which these figures lead, they are by no means the only evidence to which we can refer in proof of the progress of accumulation during a peace of unexampled duration. Mr. Porter calculates that 25,000,000*l.* of English capital have been invested in the canals, railways, and banks of the United States. Large foreign loans have also

been contracted, and 5,000,000*l.* transferred to the mines of South America and of Mexico.

We may also look to the British railroads as evidence of the rapid accumulation of wealth. The enormous sum of two hundred millions has already been expended in these works, and this within a few years; one hundred and forty millions in addition are pledged to the same purposes, and our capital has further extended itself in similar undertakings on the Continent, in India, and in our colonies. The receipts on our seven principal lines of railway exceed the revenue of many independent European States. We must guard ourselves from the supposition that we either suggest, or hold, the opinion that all these investments have been either wise or profitable. Our argument would hardly have been less applicable if this enormous capital had all been as unprofitably spent as the 50,000,000*l.* considered by the London merchants to be annually lost in bankruptcies, insolvencies, and useless and abortive speculation. We state the fact in proof only of growing accumulation; and it is plain that if the taxation of England had been so oppressive as is too generally stated, and too often believed, production must have been lessened and this accumulation have been checked. A belief that our country is more heavily burdened than other States, is irreconcilable with the undoubted fact that the conversion of income into capital is at the same time more rapid in Great Britain than in any other country, and is likewise progressive from year to year. These facts cannot but lead to the irresistible conclusion that a diminished burden of taxation is now levied out of a property steadily augmenting.

It is, however, true that in thus dealing with taxation as a whole, we do not touch upon the question of its apportionment; and it might be consistent with many of the facts on which we have relied, that injustice should exist and mischief be produced by an unwise system of taxation, even where the proportion between taxation and property seems favourable. It is true that this would speedily manifest itself in the check given to both production and accumulation,—results at variance with the proofs of British prosperity we have already mentioned. We are entitled to believe, therefore, that the amount of our taxation is not excessive, and that its apportionment is not impolitic. The practical conclusions at which Mr. Norman arrives, are,—that the positive reduction of British taxation, since the peace, has been 29 millions, or 36 per cent. on the total amount previously raised; and, — assuming our national wealth to have increased in proportion to our population, — he estimates the reduction at the higher amount of 53 percent. Accordingly, a yearly sum of 119,000,000*l.*

levied at present is only equal to 81,000,000*l.* levied at the close of the war; and our existing average burden of 52,000,000*l.* cannot press more heavily on our resources than 35,000,000*l.* would have done in 1815, — when in fact we had to provide 81,000,000*l.* On these grounds we feel justified in the conviction that England is not crippled, in her powers of production and accumulation, by either the amount or form of the taxes imposed on her by the State, and — that she pays at present less than one half the taxation borne by her thirty-five years back.

Mr. Norman's second inquiry is both interesting and important. It cannot be otherwise than instructive to compare our condition with that of France and other European countries. This inquiry, however, is necessarily less determinate than that which referred solely to England. We possess some of the elements to compare France with herself at different periods; even these are imperfect; but we are still more deficient in what is essential to enable us to compare France with England. If we could prove the proportion between the resources and the burdens of both countries at any determinate antecedent period, then indeed the progress of each would furnish from time to time some evidence for the purposes of subsequent comparison. This is, however, wanting; and therefore the second branch of Mr. Norman's work can only be considered as an approximation to the probable truth. Yet as such it is no less valuable than curious.

We are called on to assume in this argument, that the ratio between the aggregate wealth of France and her population has been sustained since the peace. If we were in possession of all the facts bearing on the case, we much doubt whether this assumption could be fully maintained. The exhaustion of capital during a war of twenty-two years, and the effect of a law which leads to a continued repartition of property after death, cannot but have restrained the accumulation of wealth. The expenditure of 1815, 1816, and 1817 was enormously enhanced by the cost of the army of observation; consequently any comparison between these and later years, tending to show a progressive increase of taxation, cannot be challenged on the ground of any unfairness. On an average of those three years the expenditure of France was 41,000,000*l.* and the population of 1817 was 29,217,000. The average expenditure of 1845, 1846, and 1847 was 62,000,000*l.*; the population in 1846 had risen to 35,400,000; and in 1848 the expenditure had risen to 72,000,000*l.*

Thus, while the actual expenditure of England had fallen 36 per cent., — and had fallen 53 per cent. upon the hypothesis that wealth had increased proportionally to her population, — the ac-

tual expenditure of France had risen more than 50 per cent. ; and, as even on the supposition of resources relatively undiminished adopted in regard to England, the expenditure of France had risen 30 per cent. If then the two countries were proportionally taxed at the close of the war, it follows that England, as compared with France, is now taxed in the proportion of 47 to 130, or, in other words, that England pays 71 per cent. less of taxation than France.

This we believe to be considerably below the mark, if we consider taxation in its apportionment as well as in its gross amount ; the impolitic manner in which some part of the taxation of France is levied greatly aggravating its pressure. Her unwise system of protection enhances all her burdens. It is calculated that on her consumption of iron alone, (an article becoming daily more important from the progress of railroads,) the increased annual charge to which she voluntarily subjects herself amounts to 62,500,000*fr.* or 2,500,000*l.*

Some allowance should probably be made in favour of France for the expenses which the French system of centralisation casts upon the State, but which are with us local charges. On the other hand, an addition should be made to the calculation by reason of that oppressive tax, the octroi ; and also for the loss of wealth produced by the organisation of the National Guard, and for the interference with industry, which cannot fail to be the effect of the conscription. The octroi yielded at Paris, in 1838, 31,930,000 francs, and at Lyons, in 1830, 2,307,330 francs. Strange as it may seem to those who consider France a country of economy, Mr. Norman concludes that a Frenchman pays more than twice as much as is contributed by his grumbling English neighbour of equal wealth or income.

It is true that Mr. Norman is not able to produce the same mass of facts in support of this conclusion, as when dealing with the case of England only. He relies too exclusively upon the progress of population, coupled with the assumption that wealth has not diminished as compared with numbers, and that the productiveness of capital is undiminished also. We have already expressed our mistrust of this mode of reasoning ; but we do not believe it has led Mr. Norman astray ; we are inclined to believe his conclusions would have been the same, had he been in possession of all those facts which Mr. Porter's tables fail to supply. From among Mr. Porter's valuable documents there is one reprinted by Mr. Norman very significant in its bearing on this branch of the subject. It is the account showing the yearly difference between the national income and expenditure of France from 1814 to 1848. Of the twenty

last years it appears, that twelve have been years in which the expenditure has exceeded the income to the amount of 1,219,000,000 of francs, and eight of them years in which the income has shown a total surplus of 210,000,000. The balance of deficiency is consequently 40,360,000*l*. The nine last years have exhibited one unvaried and augmenting deficiency, in the following ruinous progression.

Average of 3 Years.				Total Deficiency of Income.	
1840, 1841, 1842	-	-	-	-	137,000,000 fr.
1843, 1844, 1845	-	-	-	-	187,000,000 fr.
1846, 1847, 1848	-	-	-	-	794,000,000 fr.

The rapidly increasing deficiency in each of the last three years is still more indicative of an alarming increase of general distress; which, unless arrested, can hardly fail to end in national insolvency.

The accounts stand as follows—

				Total Deficiency of Income.	
1846	-	-	-	-	157,000,000 fr.
1847	-	-	-	-	307,000,000 fr.
1848	-	-	-	-	330,000,000 fr.

We sincerely wish that we could take a more encouraging view of French finance. We regret that we cannot do so, for the sake of that great country itself, on the prosperity of which our own well-being and the peace of Europe so greatly depend. But if she wishes to keep her high position among nations, she must adopt wiser methods, and rely on more trustworthy help than can be found in Bank advances, inconvertible paper currency, loans, or a protective system. For these, France must substitute, out of plain regard to her own safety, a severe economy, and a wise and liberal system of taxation. Then and then only, can we expect a full and intelligent development of the immense natural resources of France. With this view she must, above all things, eschew war, and reserve her military power for the maintenance of order,—on her maintenance of which her very social existence depends.

Mr. Norman's comparison between the financial condition of England and of other foreign Powers is slight and inconclusive; resting mainly, and (except in relation to the United States) almost exclusively, on Mr. Porter's valuable statistics in the '*Progress of the Nation*.' The following table, though formed on a principle which we have already condemned, is however of interest; and may indeed enable our readers to pursue the matter further, and to collect better data for their guidance.



	Population.	Revenue.	Charge for Public Debt.	Charge for Army, &c.	Taxation per head.	Taxation per head exclusive of Debt.
		£	£	£	s. d.	s. d.
Austria -	35,800,000	15,154,000	6,700,000	5,000,000	8 6	5 0
Bavaria -	4,500,000	3,173,000	874,000	731,000	14 1	10 2
Belgium -	4,335,000	4,704,000	1,272,000	1,597,000	21 8	15 10
Spain -	12,386,000	12,577,000	1,269,000	3,633,000	20 0	18 3
France -	35,400,000	54,293,000	15,143,000	17,768,000	29 7	22 1
Portugal -	3,745,000	2,968,000	868,000	908,000	15 10	11 2
Holland -	3,200,000	5,964,000	3,027,000	972,000	37 3	18 4
Prussia -	16,000,000	9,905,000	1,404,000	3,865,000	12 4	10 7
Russia -	54,000,000	20,000,000				
United States	20,000,000	9,959,000	723,000	8,600,000	10 0	9 3

We must remember, as some deduction from our contentment in Mr. Norman's view of the condition of the British Empire, that he has omitted all special consideration of the position of pauperised Ireland. This suggests some doubts in respect to his general conclusions; unless it be assumed that the two islands, and their interests, are so thoroughly identified that we are warranted in considering them as a whole. We cannot so far flatter either of the islands, we cannot so far flatter ourselves or Parliament, as to believe that they can be thus considered. On the contrary, we greatly fear that the misfortunes of Ireland, and the legislation of the last five years, have produced a severance in interest and in condition, which it will be most difficult to remedy, and yet which, if continued, can hardly fail to lead to increased and increasing calamities affecting the general resources of the Empire. Scarcely one of the elements from which Mr. Norman traces the proofs of prosperity in Great Britain are discernible in Ireland. We unhappily find there the very reverse; and though much of the distress of Ireland arises from famine as a primary cause, yet its formidable intensity, its extension, and the risk of its perpetuation, are occasioned mainly by ill-considered though well-intentioned laws. In a country where real property constituted, even in the most prosperous times, thirteen twentieths of the national wealth,—real property has been depreciated in value by 30 to 40 per cent., whilst taxation has increased in a still more alarming ratio. We could name a southern county, not included in the distressed districts, in which the local burdens have in four years increased four hundred per cent. In a country where house property is lamentably deficient,—rates (thrown exclusively on the landowner, even in cases in which no rents are paid,) have produced the destruction of innumerable cottages, as well as of houses of a better description. The same measures have led to the eviction of

tenants, and the multiplication of paupers, over districts whose insecurity and wretchedness have been among the most active causes of crime, — thus adding to those lamentable causes, and to their fatal effects. Capital and industry are forcibly driven out of a land, which the better description of emigrant farmer quits in despair, unable to cultivate its soil with any hope of profit. Although the encumbered state of landed property in Ireland had long been felt to be a most serious obstacle to improvement, and has been latterly held a justification for a ‘rough and ready’ measure facilitating the transfer of property in that predicament, — on the other hand, encumbrances have been largely created by Act of Parliament, even upon well-conditioned estates. The accumulation of uncollected rates cast upon the land itself as a primary charge, and the owners rendered liable for debts contracted not by themselves, but by others, are enactments, by which the Legislature, in seeking to bind property to its duties, has brought its rights and almost its existence in some instances into danger. In a community where the increased production of food and increased demand for labour were most required, our laws have converted hundreds of thousands of acres into desolate wastes; and where the want of a resident gentry was most complained of, a widely spread insolvency has been extended among that important class. This formidable and rapid progress of evil in Ireland must weaken some of Mr. Norman’s conclusions. If we persevere in a course, condemned on its introduction by the authority of science, and now unequivocally condemned by subsequent experience, we may live to see a country lying within four hours’ sail of our shores, and containing in 1841 a population of 8,000,000, become by degrees one great pauper warren, our burden and our reproach, and the most pressing danger to the prosperity of the empire.

Mr. Norman’s inquiry would have been incomplete, if he had not adverted to the spirit of economy evinced by the Government of this country, compared with that of other States. If the popular faith in the excess of British taxation is strong, at least equally strong is the belief that all successive Governments are reckless and extravagant. Now it should ever be remembered, that to believe this is to suppose that men in office, subject to the responsibility of a reformed representative system like ours, are disposed to act contrary to their own most direct interests. The administration of the day, however composed, necessarily loses more in weight and power, by any attempt to keep up an excess in our establishments, civil, or military, than they can gain by the possession of any amount of indefensible patronage. In Miss Edgeworth’s ‘Castle Rackrent, Sir Condy, when pressed to shave a second time in the same

day, readily complied with the desire, on the principle of 'doing anything for peace and quietness.' So it is frequently with Governments. They are at times but too much disposed to act on Sir Condy's principle. High estimates, heavy taxation, and unpopular votes are precisely those contingencies, which preclude all official 'rest and quietness.' They also undermine political power; and even if we adopt the most selfish theory of ministerial morals—if all sense of public duty, all personal honour, all regard for the character of a political party, and all conscientious obligations, are believed to be necessarily surrendered on kissing hands, and accepting the seals of office,—yet, no very dangerous tendency towards extravagance can now be apprehended. Successive Cabinets have shown themselves ready, at the suggestion of the House of Commons, to pare down the public establishments to their narrowest limits. We have occasionally seen this done, to the ultimate pecuniary loss of the country, which has been compelled, in subsequent years, to pay a heavy penalty for a false, because an ill-considered, economy.

But, although the economical progress of our Government has been arrested by the Canadian insurrection, by our Indian wars, by hostilities in China, by Kaffir inroads upon the Cape, and still more by certain extravagant tendencies in Parliament itself,—much good has been already effected in this direction; however apt the public are to forget it: Also the conduct of the Government, in the last year more especially, proves that we are steadily advancing in the course of retrenchment: A retrenchment which we believe may, and indeed are confident must, be carried still further.\*

We refer to our former article on this subject\*, to prove how much of the increased expense of modern times is attributable to Parliament itself; and how much also to a just and honourable endeavour by the Government and by the Legislature in the performance of high duties, formerly undervalued and neglected, and in the correction of abuses which public opinion will no longer tolerate. The morals, the education, the physical comforts, the health, the very pleasures and amusements of the people, are no longer overlooked. The supervision of poor-law administration; an inspection of our factories, of our mines, of the safety of our steam-boats and railroads; the registration of births, marriages, and deaths; the commutation of tithes; the enclosure of our commons; the superintendence of our emigration,—are all undertaken as new but expensive duties. Yet after providing for all these services,—services of which

---

\* Edin. Rev., April, 1849. Financial Prospects of 1849.

Pitt and Fox as little dreamt as Sir Robert Walpole or Secretary Cecil,—we find that our former anticipations of efficient reductions are realised in the financial arrangements of the present year. Comparing the expenditure of 1848 and 1849, this decrease has been as follows:—

	1848.	1849.	Diminution.
Army -	6,647,000	6,549,000	98,000
Navy -	7,922,000	6,942,000	980,000
Ordnance -	3,076,000	2,332,000	744,000
Miscellaneous -	4,092,000	3,911,000	181,000

We thus have effected a saving of upwards of two millions on our ordinary expenditure, besides a further reduction of 1,100,000*l.* by the cessation of an extraordinary charge. In the first of these years, the expenditure had exceeded the income by 796,000*l.*; in the latter, the excess of income is no less than 2,098,000*l.* In January, 1849, the balance in the Exchequer was 8,105,000*l.*; in January, 1850, it had risen to 9,748,000*l.*

It is true that neither the annals of France nor of any other European country can exhibit so enormous an accumulation of debt as that which arose in England from 1793 to 1814; but, on the other hand, we learn from Mr. Porter's tables, that since the peace the following satisfactory results have taken place:—

	Excess of Income over Expenditure.
12 years ending January, 1828	- £29,231,765
9 years ending January, 1837	- 16,854,536

And even in the last thirteen years, during which the state of Ireland, and other unforeseen demands, have produced an increased expenditure, and when a large amount of taxes has also been repealed, the income received has been 655,594,904*l.*, equalling our expenditure, within the small sum of 320,585*l.* We have already pointed to the continued and augmenting French deficiency during the same period.

The annual charge of the debt, funded and unfunded, including annuities, amounted in 1815 to 32,938,741*l.*, and for the year 1849 to 28,323,961*l.* These figures represent a diminished burden, exceeding four millions and a half. But, the charge in 1849 included 3,924,000*l.* for terminable annuities, of which 3,338,000*l.* will expire in 1864 and the balance in 1867. Thus, in about seventeen years, without assuming any increase of income, or any further operations for the payment of the principal, or the reduction of the interest of the debt, the annual charge must necessarily be reduced by one-seventh,—a sum more than sufficient to enable Parliament to deal with all that is most objectionable in our system of taxation. And the annual saving effected

in about half a century will amount to nearly nine millions sterling, representing at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more than a capital of 250 millions.

If our space permitted, we could have wished to carry further the comparison between the Finance of England and that of foreign countries. We could have wished, more especially, to compare our military expenditure with that of continental States. It would not have been difficult to show how much more moderate our expenditure is than theirs; more especially if we take into account the effect of a conscription in France, and add the charge which the National Guard occasions, not in money account, but in the loss of time and loss of productive labour consequent on such a service. Even among our republican brethren beyond the Atlantic, Mr. Norman considers that if they are charged, in like manner, with all the results of their militia service, the United States cannot claim any great economical superiority over the old country. Their Mexican war will, we hope, contribute to impress on their minds, as strongly as Mr. Jay and their wisest fellow-citizens can wish, the salutary lesson, — that aggressive wars are as dangerous to the finances as to the character of States; and that conquest is one of the costliest and least profitable pursuits in which either a monarchy or a commonwealth can engage.

Mr. Norman estimates our colonial expenditure at above 4,000,000*l*. We believe this to be somewhat above the range of our permanent expenditure, as defrayed out of British revenue; after deducting the cost of such interludes as Caffre wars and Canadian insurrections. Assuming the figures to be correct, the comparison between our colonial charge and that of France, the only European country to which it is needful to refer, is disposed of by the following quotation from M. Thiers' last report. He thus describes the relations between France and Algeria:—*‘La France que Dieu semble avoir destinée à ne se reposer jamais, même dans la paix, la France a su accomplir la seule grande chose qui se soit faite depuis trente années. Elle a soumis, et elle a commencé à civiliser un vaste empire, le mieux placé pour elle qu'il y eut sur la terre, et on peut l'espérer, empire plus solidement assuré que les conquêtes perdues à Leipsig et à Waterloo.’* It must require a full faith in this assertion, to reconcile the French tax-payer to the price which the ex-minister of France admits to have been paid for these African glories:—*‘Pendant vingt ans on lui a dit de ne pas trop s'engager, de ne dépenser ni trop d'argent ni trop d'hommes; et n'examinant point si on avait raison ou tort, conduite par un instinct irrésistible elle a envoyé en Afrique jusqu'à cent mille soldats, dépensé jusqu'à cent millions par an. . . .’*

*'Elle a persévéré vingt années sans être assurée d'un profit quelconque.'* We have hitherto been accustomed to regard M. Thiers as a very eloquent man, but we are now almost inclined to consider him in the new character of a master of sly sarcasm and irony. Whatever be his motive, the facts he states are sufficient for our purpose. They will fully enable our readers to compare the colonial budget of England with that of the only European country which admits of such comparison; and we venture to anticipate that even the most critical of our colonial reformers must admit that on the score of expense, no less than in the value of our colonies, we have no reasons to look with envy at our neighbours. To those who extend their thoughts beyond the present, and who do not consider it inconsistent with prudence and philosophy to calculate the future; to those who are of opinion that value exists in reversion as well as in possession; to those who believe that the infancy and youth of States may be feeble and costly, whilst their progress and maturity may be largely profitable; to those who think that a balance-sheet does not afford the only solution to public questions, and that duty and honour are more enduring as well as more sacred bonds than mere profit and loss, the comparison between the British colonies and Algeria may not be unimportant. If there remain any considerable number of sceptics on the present and the future value of colonies, as many as are open to conviction should be converted into true believers by one practical experiment. Let the Government and the Legislature apply themselves seriously to the question of Emigration, and even if the annual cost of our colonies were as high as it is estimated by Mr. Norman, or even double that amount, the expenditure might be not only nationally justified, but nationally repaid. The most valuable of all possessions, the most profitable of all investments, would be such as raise new markets for our manufactures, like those of British North America and Australia, and supply us with valuable and rapidly increasing produce in return,—affording us both safe asylums, and pleasant homes for our surplus population, adding not only to our wealth but to our happiness, and diffusing our liberties, our laws, our literature, our domestic and moral habits, and our religious faith, over the most remote portions of the globe.

We must not, however, blind ourselves to some important considerations on which we are compelled to touch before we close, and to which we might have wished that the high capacity and generous sympathies of Mr. Norman had been more distinctly applied. It is most true that from his able analysis of our condition he may with confidence infer the progress of our

wealth, and the comparative lightness of our burdens. He may also very justly conclude that a majority of our fellow subjects have acquired, and are still acquiring, a larger command over the comforts and necessities of life. A house or cottage, as now rebuilt, is fifty or one hundred per cent. more commodious than that for which it is a substitute. The new school or the new church, if less picturesque than the ruined building which it replaces, is in every important particular preferable. Better clothing, furniture, food, miraculous powers of locomotion, are brought within the reach of classes whose interests were comparatively little thought of and ill-provided for in former times. Above all, knowledge and religious instruction are rapidly extending their genial and vivifying light. Mr. Norman may point out innumerable consolatory facts in support of his conclusions, and boldly say to his opponent, — *Si argumentum quæras, circumspice*. But, unfortunately, whilst many classes are improving, there is one unhappy class or more, of which we cannot ignore the existence. We are unwilling to designate them '*les classes dangereuses*,' as they are termed in France. Some of these, it is true, may be prepared for crime, but they are in many cases prepared for it by want, — *malesuada fames*, — acting upon ignorance. This class is numerous and restless. It is full of discontent both personal and social. The very wealth and prosperity which are rising around them on all sides suggest exciting contrasts. The acuteness of intellect to which our irregular civilisation has given an edge and a direction equally mischievous, the sensibility to wrong and suffering which is necessarily a part of it, the political activity with which false theories have been propagated, the eagerness with which they have been embraced — these, with the sad estrangement which selfishness and fastidious refinement have created between the different orders of society, have produced, or cast forth, from among us a race of Pariahs whom we dare not forget, even though the statistics of trade are favourable, and bullion has accumulated in the Bank. Mr. Norman is too wise not to know this well. We could have wished that he had brought more distinctly before his readers the fact, that there are two sides even to a ripening peach. He touches on the subject truly and feelingly; but yet he tempts us to walk too exclusively in the warm and cheerful '*mezzo giorno*' of the path of life. There are undoubtedly, on the other hand, many writers, of a different school, who seem to delight in representing all that is dark and alarming. Of this the first number of '*The Latter Day Pamphlets*' is a very striking example. Of that publication we cannot say that '*the sun shines bright on merry Carlyle*.' The blue lights, the sea signals of distress,

or the glare of coloured resin, the decorations of the last scene of a pantomime, seem the author's favourite mode of illumination. His graphic and powerful exaggerations resemble the descriptions which a Yankee is said to have given of his favourite horse. 'Sir, he is all thunder and lightning, with a dash of 'the earthquake in him.' If we understand aright what this extraordinary pamphlet means, we are called on to believe that we have fallen amid 'days of endless calamity, disruption, 'dislocation, confusion worse confounded,' which, 'if they are 'not days of endless hope, are days of utter despair.' We cannot subscribe to this article of faith, neither can we admit that our 'Government is tumbling and drifting on the whirl-pools and mud deluges, floating atop in a conspicuous manner, 'no whither, like the carcase of a drowned ass,' or that 'authentic chaos is come up to this sunny Cosmos, and that all 'mankind are singing Gloria in excelsis to it.' Though not speaking the same language, much more to the purpose are Mr. Norman's admissions of the existence of evil even amid growing prosperity. He points with unaffected sympathy to 'the 'quantity of suffering arising from poverty, painful to the eye 'of humanity, and the more keenly felt by those who endure it, 'because they see more clearly than formerly the luxury of 'those above them, and are more fully persuaded that their 'sorrows and privations arise in a great degree from the cruelty 'and selfishness of the possessors of power. We have in full 'activity the struggle between those who have and those who 'have not, which has existed in one shape or other since the 'institution of property.'

To this source Mr. Norman traces the opposition raised to the reform of the English poor-law. To the same cause he may, with equal truth, trace the arguments adduced in favour of the wide-spread desolation created by the system of out-door relief in Ireland. We have offered bounties upon pauperism, and are astonished that paupers multiply. We have cast an unlimited weight upon property, and we express our surprise that property can hardly sustain the burden. We neglect to relieve our seats of teeming population from their disproportionate numbers, and then think it extraordinary that the numbers should corrupt and fester. We refuse our colonies the industrious emigrants whom they demand, and whom we could so well spare, and we force upon them the convicts they reject,—until our colonists have been seen enforcing their rejection by means of a resistance unparalleled in its violence and harshness, and inconsistent with order and with law. Whilst all thinking men admit and deplore the leeway which still remains to be made up



in the work of education, zealots and fanatics are disputing about 'management clauses' and demanding the extension of episcopal power over English grammar and the multiplication table. Lamentable as is still the deficiency in the means of religious instruction, we have bishops who are embarrassing the consciences of their clergy, by a closeness of definition in mysteries which it has not pleased inscrutable wisdom distinctly to reveal; and clergy who are debating on prevenient grace. What should we think of any other nation, where such follies were withdrawing it from the performance of obvious and pressing duties?

The unlimited promises held out by our laws for the relief of destitution, compared with their incomplete performances, add to all these mischiefs. Men deprived of proper guidance are left exposed to fatal impulses. The truth, which a still higher authority than Mr. Norman's also teaches, is not impressed on their minds, but the very opposite doctrines. 'That man shall live by the sweat of his own brow, and not upon the industry of others,' is His declaration; 'that weal or woe, even in this world, must depend on our own conduct; and that to take property forcibly from its possessors and to bestow it on one great corporation formed of all the members of society, is the surest way to destroy it. It is easy to plunder the rich, to make them poor; but in so doing to make all the poor rich is a result which neither legislative skill nor despotic power can effect.'

It is a remarkable coincidence that, contemporaneously with Mr. Norman's enunciation of the true principles on which the well-being of the labouring classes so mainly rests, the same subject of relief for poverty should have been discussed in the report presented to the French legislature by M. Thiers. Though there are parts of that able report which may be questioned, yet it is impossible not to admire its precision, its clearness, and the truth with which important general principles are set forth. In many particulars this report confirms, and is almost identical with, the opinions we have quoted from Mr. Norman.

'Si l'état donnait au-delà de ses moyens pour soulager les misères d'autrui il serait coupable, car l'état ne peut pas être imprudent; il serait spoliateur, car l'état ne donne pas comme l'individu son propre bien: il donne le bien de tous; et comme dans l'impôt il entre la contribution des pauvres, et des pauvres plus que des riches à cause de leur nombre, il prendrait à certains pauvres pour donner à certains autres, ce que serait non seulement injuste, mais absurde et déraisonnable. Les notions de justice doivent prendre place ici à côté des notions de bienfaisance.' (P. 12.)

M. Thiers, in a further passage, explains, with greater dis-

tinctness, the dangers which he anticipates from misapplying the principles which ought to govern the relief of destitution:—

‘Hors les cas exceptionnels la société qui voudrait, à quelque degré que ce fût, se charger du sort d’une partie de ses membres, en ferait des oisifs, des turbulents, des factieux, au dépens de tous les citoyens laborieux et paisibles auxquels le même privilège ne s’appliquerait pas. *Elle périrait sous la ruine financière* et la violence des factions encouragées par l’oisiveté. Une partie des citoyens, et la meilleure, payerait de ses sueurs les loisirs de ceux qui bouleverseraient le pays, et contribueraient à le plonger dans la misère.’ (P. 32.)

We have pressed upon this subject because we believe it is from the condition of the distressed classes, rather than from the state of our finances, that national dangers can arise. We apprehend no risk from any permanent excess in the national expenditure. Army, navy, and ordnance contain within themselves their own natural limitations: and wakeful eyes are on them. The Customs and Excise will, we doubt not, exhibit a reasonable and steady increase. But if the whole property of a country is to be considered as mortgaged to a purpose without limit,—if the owner and occupier are to be considered but as possessors holding jointly with those who do not labour, and who employ no capital,—then we apprehend that it is in vain we find our wealth bearing a favourable proportion to our people: we shall soon discover, to our cost, that the breakers are ahead; the perils from which England was only rescued by the enactment of the new poor-law will again be visible in the wasting of her resources and the annihilation of her industry. We urge this the more strongly because we believe that on this question,—that of the labour fund,—the interests of the poor are fully as much at stake as those of the rich. We believe also that it is in vain that our State expenditure, as compared with our productive capital, may be less than that of other European communities, if we assume a burden such as no other State sustains in an equal degree,—a burden capable of undefined extension and devouring that very capital on which it relies for support.

We do not shrink from confessing our belief that it is neither on any great, or, as we should term it, a rash repeal of taxation, that we rely for progressive improvement or permanent security. Neither do we trust to the possibility or the effects of any great curtailment of our expenditure. We do believe, however, that our expenditure may in some respects be better applied. Much has been spent,—perhaps we might say wasted,—in lavish military works, or ill-considered dock-yard experiments, rashly undertaken and indiscreetly persevered in. In case it had been applied to all that could raise the condition of our people, pro-

vide for their health, add to their physical comforts, increase their intelligence, improve their morals, and diffuse among them the blessings of religious truth and guidance, it would have been more economically, as well as wisely, appropriated, than even if absorbed by the repeal of the duty on the advertisement by which this publication is announced, the excise on the paper on which we are writing, or the stamp on those useful journals, in which we reviewers often profit by finding ourselves reviewed. We believe also, without undervaluing or being culpably indifferent to political progress, that after the stability conferred upon the State by the Reform Bill, and the impulse given to our industry by what we may now term the complete freedom of trade, no questions of domestic economy or of finance are so important as such reforms, and, we must add, such a wise expenditure as will tend to improve the physical, the moral, and religious condition of our noble, enduring, and industrious population.

- ART. VII.—1. *The Village Notary. A Romance of Hungarian Life.* Translated from the Hungarian of BARON EÖTVÖS, by OTTO WENCKSTERN. With Introductory Remarks by FRANCIS PULSZKY. 3 vols. post 8vo. London: 1850.
2. *Memoirs of a Hungarian Lady.* By THERESA PULSZKY. With an Historical Introduction by FRANCIS PULSZKY. 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1850.
3. *Genesis der Revolution in Oesterreich, im Jahre 1848.* 8vo. pp. 418. Leipzig: 1848.
4. *Ungarns Verfassung.* Beurtheilt von Dr. J. WILDNER, Edlen von Maithstein, Indigena von Ungarn. 8vo. pp. 130. Leipzig: 1849.
5. *Ludwig Kossuth und Ungarns neueste Geschichte.* Von ARTHUR FREY. 3 vols. med. 8vo. Mannheim: 1849.
6. *Enthüllungen aus Oesterreich's jüngster Vergangenheit.* Von einem Mitgliede der linken des aufgelösten Oesterreichischen Reichstages. 8vo. pp. 282. Hamburg: 1849.
7. *Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeits Krieg, nach den besten Quellen und zahlreichen Mittheilungen Ungarischer Notabilitäten dargestellt.* Von Dr. A. SCHÜTTE. 2 vols. 8vo. Dresden: 1850.
8. *Die letzten Tage der Magyarischen Revolution. Enthüllungen der Ereignisse in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen, seit dem 1sten July, 1849.* Von ALEXANDER SZILAGYI. Leipzig: 1850.

9. *Letters from the Danube.* By the Author of 'Gisella.' 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1847.
10. *A Voice from the Danube; or the True State of the Case between Austria and Hungary.* By an Impartial Observer. pp. 212. 8vo. London: 1850.

THE German books on Hungary, whose titles we have prefixed, are to be had in London. They will direct the reader to new sources of information, and to various points of view. We propose at present to introduce him only to the Village Notary and the Hungarian Lady, in their English dress. The nationality of its people, their martial prowess, and present unhappy fate, have invested Hungary with the interest of a second Poland: and Western Europe must be naturally desirous to learn something of their civil and social life. We wish the picture were a pleasanter one.

As compositions, neither of the works which we have selected stands on the level of 'high art.' Their authors are not inspired by that abstraction, which metaphysicians are pleased to call 'the beautiful.' Baron Eötvös was a member of the Hungarian Opposition; and, in the eventful summer of 1848, he filled a post in the Batthyany Cabinet. Madame Pulszky is the wife of a gentleman who was at all times a zealous supporter of Kossuth's measures. It were, indeed, an anomaly, if the productions of persons who played a conspicuous part in the late Hungarian troubles were without a strong leaven of politics. Of such works we could not, even if we would, separate the spirit from the form. They were written for political purposes. The intention which pervades their every line, the maxims which they inculcate, the opinions which they profess, and the tendencies which they encourage, necessarily exclude that absolute indifference, that neutral 'objectivity,' which the votaries of high art persist in demanding. Neither of our authors can boast of possessing the dry repose and imperturbable equanimity which some of our German neighbours extol as the *acmé* of literary perfection; although Goëthe, their prototype, marks those qualities strongly enough by making them the characteristics of his spectral Sphinxes. Nor do either Baron Eötvös nor Madame Pulszky take a panoramic view of the scenes which they attempt to portray. On the contrary, we find them, in the very midst of the contending factions, treating of the subjects nearest to their hearts with all the enthusiasm which belongs to noble minds, yet with more moderation than we, in reason, could have expected.

We shall best learn the special moral of 'The Village Notary,'

and the circumstances in which it originated, from M. Pulszky's Preface. The Opposition to the 'Paternal Absolutism' of the Austrian Camarilla was divided for some time, it seems, into three parties. One, the party of agricultural and material improvements, was led by Count Szechenyi; another, that of legal and parliamentary reforms, was led by Kossuth; Joseph, Baron Eötvös, headed the third. The object of this third party was a new political fabric, founded on natural rights and on the principle of centralisation under a free parliamentary government, in the place of the ancient county institutions. But, the popular instincts of their countrymen ran counter to these innovations. Quitting parliament, therefore, for a season, the Baron amused himself in his retirement by writing a sketch of life in a Hungarian province: 'in which he put together a variety of 'small sketches and studies from Nature, and formed them into 'one grand picture; for the express purpose' (continues M. 'Pulszky) 'of caricaturing the political doings in our country. 'But, fortunately for the public, Baron Eötvös was a better 'poet than a politician; and his political pamphlet ripened, very 'much against his will, into one of the most interesting works 'of fiction that the Hungarian literature can boast of. His 'book was eagerly read, and enthusiastically admired.'

A novel written under these circumstances, and for such a purpose, and—notwithstanding any over-colouring of the defects of their provincial institutions,—enthusiastically admired upon the spot, and now translated, we understand, at the suggestion of M. Pulszky, must have enough of local truth in it, to entitle it to a higher place than that of a mere literary novelty in the eyes of English readers.

Travelling in Hungary in 1806, Bishop Heber observes in a letter to his mother, that 'there are few countries, where an 'Englishman could obtain so much important information as in 'Hungary, the constitution of the government of which is a 'complete comment on the ancient principles of our own, as 'low down as Edward the Third. . . . Like England (he adds) 'Hungary everywhere shows the deep scars of her former civil 'disturbances. Every county town has its ruined walls.' Yet, however curious it may be to go back with the good Bishop for resemblances between the present Hungary and the former England, the spectacle of the contrast which the two kingdoms are now exhibiting, is only made by it the more painful. It will not lessen our sympathy, to think that, as it is with the people of Hungary, it might have been with us. Let us only imagine our country ever since the fourteenth century to have been the battle-field, on which Turks, Czechs, and Styrians contended for

supremacy,—that our princes had been able to lean upon the sword of a neighbouring monarch,—that we had imprudently put a King of France upon the throne of England,—that our armies had been sacrificed on a foreign soil, to establish there a power which was to be turned against us in our own,—that improvements had been checked, justice perverted, abuses fostered,—that public virtue had been discountenanced and self-seeking servility loaded with wealth and honour,—is it certain that the fortunes of the two countries would at this day have been so utterly opposite as they now are, and their histories alike only in the records of their early constitution, their common patriotism, and their common valour?

The cloud, which is hanging over that ill-starred country, is felt by its inhabitants to have settled on the very face of Nature. The weary journey of the Jenny Deans of Walter Scott was almost on as sad an errand as that of our author's Susi, the outlaw's wife. But what opposite feelings are summoned up along the boundless plains of melancholy Hungary, to those which were recalled by the rural landscape of merry England!

“The Hungarian's joy is in tears,” says the old proverb: And why not? Since the features of the parent tribe are handed down from one generation to another, there is nothing more natural, than that we should retain the *historical* features of our ancestors, viz. the stamp of gravity which the events of their time impressed upon their faces. The Hungarians of old had good cause for weeping. Other nations have recovered from the wounds of their past; and however sad their popular melodies may be, (for they spring from a time of sorrow and sadness,) the lamentations of the old text have given way to merry words. But the lower classes in our country have very little to laugh at, even in these days of universal prosperity. Their songs are sad, as they were in the days when the crescent shone from the battlements of Buda. For there are people who are ignorant of all history, but that of their own village; and who, consequently, have no idea that there has been any change in our country ever since the expulsion of the Turks. The peculiar gravity which characterises the Magyars is partly an historical reminiscence, and partly the result of that gloomy tract of our country which is chiefly inhabited by the Magyar population. What traveller can traverse our vast plains, and keep his temper? The virgin forest, which at one time covered that plain, is gone: the impenetrable foliage which overshadowed this fertile soil, has fallen under the axe. The many-voiced carol of birds, the merry spirits of the greenwood, where are they? The forest land has become a heath; but we have little cause at rejoicing at our victory over Nature. The inhabitants of other countries see many things to gladden their hearts. Houses, trees, hedges, corn-fields, reminding them of the thrift of their ancestors, spur them on to increased activity, and inspire them with a desire to

fashion the land into a monument of their existence." Our Puztas have nothing of the kind. All is silent and desolate, filling the mind with sad thoughts. Many generations passed over them without leaving a trace of their existence; and the traveller, as he pursues his solitary way across the heath, feels the mournful conviction, that he, too, steps onward to his grave,—that the plain will cover him as a boundless ocean.'

The scene of the story is laid in the county of Takshony; and county politics in their most violent and sordid form occupy as prominent a place in it, as M. Pulszky's preface would lead us to expect. We are taken successively by the natural course of events to that great theatre of provincial excitement and intrigue,—the triennial election of the county magistrates; to the ignorant and partial administration of justice,—in the proceedings before the *statarium* or special commission, under which the Palatine could at any time proclaim a county for a twelve-month; to the blind and brutal indifference of the executive, as shown in the filth and misery and recklessness of their gaols. The two figures, round whom the principal interest revolves—Tengelyi the notary of Tissaret, and Viola an outlaw—are intended to personify, in the notary, the broad distinction which separates the nobleman, or, in other words, the freeman, from the population at large; and in the outlaw, the daily and intolerable oppressions to which the population at large is subjected, and by which some of them, and those very far from the worst, are infuriated into crime. Tengelyi is a man of far too virtuous and stoical a cast not to be hated by officials, such as popular or class election is here described to have returned. Together with his own papers—the evidences of his free descent—he had unfortunately charge of papers belonging to his friend Vandory the curate, which would show that Vandory was in truth elder brother to Rety, the squire and sheriff, and, as such, entitled to the family estate. The possession of these papers is the pivot on which the incidents, necessary to set the characters in action, are made to turn. They are first stolen at the instigation of Lady Rety, the sheriff's wife, a kind of Lady Macbeth in her way, and one Catspaw, her attorney. They are rescued by Viola at the very moment of their being stolen: retaken from Viola when he is captured in his forest fastness: recovered again by him on his escape, upon which occasion Catspaw is murdered. On this, Viola flees with them to a distance; and they are only brought to light again at the critical moment, when their re-appearance and that of Viola, who had been for some time hiding as a herdsman, have become necessary to save Tengelyi's life from the charge of having been concerned in Catspaw's murder.

Here is breadth of canvas enough, for a great variety of events and characters. A proper seasoning of love also is added, to make things pleasant. Tengelyi's home is a manly contrast to that of Rety, 'marrying discord in a noble wife.' But the crowning pathos, as wife and mother, is reserved for Susi, the wife of Viola. The plot is as good as, perhaps a little better than, those of the majority of novels. Its interest is constantly kept up, and the persons brought forward upon its stage act admirably together. In the assassination of Mr. Catspaw, the wicked attorney, in the suicide of Lady Rety, in the expiatory death of Viola and the ruin of his family, the laws of poetical justice are observed with a severity which will satisfy the moral sense of the most scrupulous novel reader. But for more curious and thoughtful readers the higher attraction will prevail,—that of a historical romance, or picture of the social state of Hungary. Besides those aspects of society and of human nature which are common to at least every part of Europe, there are some introduced, more especially peculiar to its Eastern regions. In no period of English history could Jews or Gypsies have been plausibly represented in the parts which are here assigned to them; and the outlaw, transferred to England, could belong to no later time than the heroic days of Robin Hood. In that age, also, our County Courts and local jurisdictions, — our sheriffs and conservators of the peace, elected by the freeholders, — and our mixture of administrative and judicial functions, might have been, perhaps, as bad.

It is of little importance, except historically, that the line by which the population of Hungary is separated into two divisions, is drawn by the privilege of class and not of race, — by the distinction between Freeman and Serf, — rather than that between Magyar and Slave. Tengelyi's horror at discovering that he has been robbed of the documents which establish his free descent, exhibits the terrible distinction in a dramatic form. 'We are no longer noble! We and our children are not noble! We are peasants! things to be despised, to be kicked, to be trodden under foot; things that have no property and that can have no merits; things like those which inhabit the hovels around us. They are not aliens, because they were born here; but still they have no rights, no property, and no country.' The history of Viola is the history of this distinction, as carried out to its most fatal consequences: so much so, that on laying down the book we are surprised that it has not been named after him, rather than after the Village Notary.

Viola, the peasant, whom oppression has goaded on to crime, is a true child of the Hungarian plains. Patient, enduring, ignorant, and withal proud and reckless, — he is a fair specimen



of that hardy race whose late struggle for independence has made them a subject of interest and compassion to the civilised world. In drawing that sketch, the author had no need to scrape together the filings of a classical workshop: nature—the nature of his own country—gave him the material and the model. Thanks to a happy instinct, he seized them, and from that instant the form of the victim of agrarian despotism stands prominently forward as the real hero of the work. Viola—but we leave him to tell his own tale: as his wife before had also told it:—

“I was humble and inoffensive,” said he, “and yet they did not spare me. I did my duty; indeed, I did more than my duty. I obeyed when they commanded. I took my hat off when I met them. I fawned upon them like a dog. I would have kissed their feet to induce them to leave Susi and my child alone, to leave my house alone, and yet——” Viola remembered again all the insults he had suffered. He recollected how they would have forced him to leave his wife in her hour of sorrow; how they dragged him through the village; how the justice gave orders to tie him to the whipping-post; how he seized the axe, and turned its edge against the head of a fellow-creature; and how the blood filled him with horror. He raised his hands to Heaven! “No!” cried he; “may God have mercy upon me! but whatever I may have done, I cannot repent it. If I were to live it over again,—if I were to see them standing round me, laughing and jeering,—and if I were to see the axe, I’d seize it again, and woe to the man that should come near me!”

Viola, driven out of house and home, banished to the woods, hunted down like a beast of prey, and turning round to strike at the heart of his oppressors, is far from being a fictitious character in Hungary; as Mr. Palgrave Simpson, for example, had an opportunity of describing,—though a passing traveller and stranger. The concluding scenes of Viola’s life from the time of his seeking shelter for his wife and children in a mountain *tanya*, are very affecting.

It is not easy to imagine a more degraded class than that of the Hungarian peasant. Such a class, however, unfortunately, is found in the Hungarian Jews; ‘born to be a sharer in the ‘distress of his family,—brought up to suffer from the injustice ‘of the masses,—cast loose upon the world, to be not free, but ‘abandoned,—struggling for his daily bread, not by honest ‘labour, for that is forbidden to a Jew, but by trickery and ‘cunning, crawling on the earth like a worm,—which any body ‘may tread on and crush,—hated, hunted, persecuted, scouted.’ The brutality with which Mr. Paul Skinner, the district judge, conducts the examination of Jantshi, when under the suspicion of murder, and the scene where Jantshi dies of a gaol fever, are

in sad conformity with this description. They go some way to explain the enthusiasm which prompted the Jews, during the late insurrection, to take up arms and die for Kossuth; the penalty for which they are now enduring at the savage hands of Haynau, — though by the mother's side, himself a Jew. It was the same with the peasantry: whatever Heber may have remarked on the feudal and limited authority under which they lived, as being 'absolute liberty, when compared with the West Indian despotism of a Russian master.' Presuming them to be the best judges, on which side they had most to hope and most to fear we may safely conclude that they were convinced that the numerous abuses which constitute the very substance of this story had some chance of being reformed under Kossuth and his colleagues, but were certain to be maintained by the Conservatives of Presburgh and Vienna. This must be the key to the translation of the present work, — supposing it to owe its appearance before the English public to M. Pulszky. So uninviting a picture of Hungarian affairs, we may be sure, would never have been unfolded to us at his suggestion, if he had not considered it to be in the interest of the great cause to which he had devoted himself, to call Baron Eötvös as a witness to the state of Hungary *before* the late insurrection. We here see what were the public and private vices which three centuries of foreign misrule had engendered, — what the abuses, which it was the aim of Kossuth and the Reformers to abolish, and of the Austrian *misrulers* to prolong.

It may be proper to add, before taking leave of 'The Village Notary,' that M. Otto Wenckstern has used the privilege of an intelligent translator, and has suppressed those parts of his text, which, from having been adapted to a particular class or season, appeared no longer suitable. By abridging the speeches, and condensing the descriptions both of characters and scenery, particular passages have been lightened, and the work brought within the limits of an English novel, though at the cost of the somewhat too epic breadth of the original. This is the manner, after the example of Schlegel, in which the German public has been made familiar with the choicest works of English and Spanish literature. It is of course a delicate jurisdiction, and can only be entrusted to a skilful hand.

The two volumes of 'Memoirs of a Hungarian Lady,' with their introduction and appendix, are the joint production of M. and Madame Pulszky. While the latter records her impressions and recollections of Hungarian life, we have to thank M. Pulszky for a brief and very able summary of the history of Hungary, from the days of Arpad to the reign of Ferdinand the

First, and the reform movement of 1847. Not a few among our readers will perhaps be astonished to learn that the History of Hungary, on which German writers have enlarged only to record the frequent contests between their own nation and the Hungarian people, abounds in interesting incidents and useful lessons for the statesman and philosophic historian. The gradual developement of the Hungarian constitution and the propagation of Christianity and civilisation under the House of Arpad; the power and prosperity of the Hungarian kingdom under Matthias Corvinus, its decline under a race of weak and improvident princes; the invasion of the Turks,—the battle of Mohatsh,—the advent of the House of Hapsburg-Lorraine,—and the contest for rights and privileges, which the Hungarian nation has carried on with the princes of that House for the last three hundred years;—these several particulars form a striking and novel picture, however much it may suffer in its general effect, as here presented, from the press of persons and events. To trace the story of ten centuries within the limits of one hundred and thirty-five octavo pages must be an arduous undertaking at all times; but the difficulty of the task increases, when, as in the present instance, nothing whatever can be taken for granted. While we admire M. Pulszky's comparative success, in crowding so many facts, and these too facts of the most heterogeneous description, into so small a space, with proportionably so exiguous a degree of inconvenience to himself and his readers, and while we are fully alive to the usefulness of his sketch for our immediate necessities, we are yet of opinion that the 'History of Hungary' from the 'contrat social' of Almosh and his associates, down to the Repudiation Act of 1849, remains to be written, and that this important gap in our historical literature is still open to the competition of historians. Let us not, however, be misunderstood. We are far from calling out for another 'Handbook,' or 'Historical Catechism.' The work which we desire should be more than a collection of dates and names. Its author ought to improve upon the hints which M. Pulszky has thrown out in the course of his narrative. Taking his stand on the fruitful ground which has been lately conquered for us in the conduct of history, he should portray the commencement and the developement of the Hungarian kingdom,—the various influences of Eastern and Western civilisation which met on the neutral soil of the ancient Magyars,—the prosperity and power of a free people under a line of free princes; he should trace the progress of dynastic feuds and encroachments, and the events which they successively originated;—and lastly, he should review, intelligently and

faithfully, the long train of causes which led to the fatal obstructions, and to the consequent deterioration of the Hungarian institutions,—and to that lamentable state of things which Baron Eötvös satirizes, and which has since obtained a new term of wretched and precarious existence by Georgey's surrender at Vilagosh.

Madame Pulszky's part in these two volumes shows, perhaps to a greater extent than she intended, what must have been the condition of the Austrian capital before the revolution of 1848. We commenced the perusal of her work with a mixture of sorrow and doubt: we leave it with unqualified astonishment. We were prepared to find in her pages a harassing struggle between her head and heart; a contest of her reason with her love of home; and alternate yearnings from the country of her adoption towards the country of her birth. We were mistaken. Madame Pulszky, though a native of Vienna, feels and sympathises only with the Magyars. She had for many years been taught to consider Hungary as 'an uncultivated, 'unpeopled land, in which only here and there forlorn mortals 'wandered around with sheepskins,' and 'where only single towns 'rose like oases in a desert.' Yet, the very Magyar language, which she at one time looked down upon as 'a strange dialect 'which could not have any real meaning,' and which 'was only 'to be understood by conventional signs or some kind of intuitive knowledge,' has since so grown upon her on a better acquaintance, that her Magyar orthography of persons and places is now a subject of greater curiosity than convenience to an English reader. In her girlhood it was but seldom, that the persons who were about her condescended to mention the name of Hungary, whose frontier towns may be descried from the height of the metropolitan cathedral of St. Stephen. When they spoke of it, it was only to show their ignorance and self-sufficiency. Nevertheless, after Madame Pulszky once crossed the frontier, she appears to have readily transferred her allegiance to the new scenes and new impressions which now surrounded her. There is nothing in her book of that sentimental longing with which Germans are said to cling to the country of their birth. At Szeczeny, her husband's seat, we find her exclusively devoted to the entertainment of her Magyar friends, to her household, and to the wants of the peasant population; and when in the summer of 1848, the tide of events carries her back to Vienna, we find her in a quiet retreat, at some distance from the capital, watching the convulsions of the Austrian empire with the indifference of a foreigner, and bestowing her interest upon them only in so far as they are likely to affect the affairs of Hungary.

On the breaking out of the war, she recedes before the advancing Austrians. She leaves Szeczeny and wanders about in search of a home for herself and her children; until at last, closely pressed on all sides, after a hundred dangers, fatigues, and disappointments, and after separating from her children for their sakes and her own, she is compelled to appeal to the humanity of strangers, who protect her on her journey through Moravia, and on her flight over the Prussian frontier.

This is the substance of Madame Pulszky's narrative; agreeably diversified with sketches and anecdotes from Magyar life, as well as with ancient legends from Hungarian history and modern passages in the late war of independence. It cannot fail to excite an interest in readers of all classes,—in those who open a book at random only for amusement, as well as in those who look to literature for something more enduring. As far as we ourselves are concerned, we have to thank these volumes for a lesson of graver and deeper import. It appears from many parts of her narrative that Madame Pulszky is *not* a heartless woman. Her very want of practice in the craft of authorship gives the critic a greater confidence in his inferences from what she writes. How then can we explain that evident absence of all interest in her native land, which every line of her narrative betrays? And how is it that her heart so opens and overflows with a new affection—*amor tam improvisus ac repertinus*—for the country of her adoption? There is more in this than the conjugal relation will account for. Is it that Hungary presents itself as an object of attachment, in a sense that Vienna cannot?

The answer to these questions is in itself a condemnation of what Austria has been, and, we fear also, of what Austria still is. Madame Pulszky is most Austrian when she seems most forgetful of Austria. That country has not, in fact, any distinct geographical or even political existence. It is an abstraction. Before the revolution, the name was used to express the joint influence and action of certain bureaucratic despots: at the present moment it embodies the power and the will of the army and its commanders. Austria exists through them and for them. She now has no resting place on the shores of the Adriatic or at the foot of the Alps: neither the moors and pine-forests of Lithuania, nor the Puszta of Hungary condescend to own in her even the moral superiority of their Empire-State. But the presence of a mixed army of Bohemians, Moravians, Croats, Germans, Lombards, Tyrolese, and Magyars, impresses on each of the various provinces which they hold in subjection to the sovereignty of the House of Hapsburg-Lorraine, the name and the historical attributes of Austria. This historical distinction,

however, is neither sought for when wanting, nor envied to those who possess it; and though the natives of the various provinces may cleave to the love and the traditions of their home, their patriotism is confined to the 'kingdom,' 'duchy,' or 'county,' which gave them birth. The undoubted bravery of the troops which fight under the double-headed eagle of Austria, is as little deserving of the name of patriotism as the zeal of the Prætorian guards, who fought with equal devotion, whether against the Cæsars or against the enemies of the Cæsars, is entitled to that sacred name. The inhabitants of Vienna and of Austria Proper have not even a provincial patriotism to support them in their narrow path of political virtue. For, subjected to the immediate sway of a reigning faction, and open to the irruption of a hundred conflicting nationalities from the south and north, east and west, their city, the capital of the Austrian empire, has long since come to be 'the common sewer' of every nationality,—while it can give birth to none. Her chief characteristic is her want of character; while her most immediate political misfortune is her utter inability to exist under any other government and under different circumstances.

These are not Madame Pulszky's assertions. That lady would not, we fear, sanction the conclusions to which we have come; supported though they are by her own statements and the various books and pamphlets which have lately been published on the Austrian revolution and the Hungarian wars.

In conclusion, we disclaim any imputation of willingly going out of our way to say offensive things. The Austrian press has frequently accused the organs of public opinion in this country of a meddling desire to widen the breach between the various classes, provinces, and nationalities of Austria. We have no such wish. Far from it. But we must speak of public events and public characters, of the conduct of governments as well as of individuals, according as we find them. Windham, speaking of Bonaparte, refused to adopt the subterfuge of the timid citizen who called after the burglars,—'You honest gentlemen, that are breaking into my house;' or to imitate the Irishman in confusing the names of things, by advertising the silk stockings which he had lost, under the name of worsted, in the hope of getting them back so much cheaper. Actions do not change their nature, in consequence of their being committed by persons in high places: and if humanity, truth, and justice had no other home on earth, they ought to find one in the breasts of kings,—and, we will add, the representatives of kings. Great successes and great misfortunes make an open space around them: and publicity follows in the track of fate. That

this should be so, is some consolation to the innocent; while it is the only punishment,—from which there is no escape,—even for hardhearted and triumphant guilt.

ART. VIII.—*An Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion.* By GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Esq. London: 1849.

MR. LEWIS in literature resembles the maker of a special survey in geography. He takes an apparently small province in philology, politics, or philosophy, extends to every part of it a minute investigation, and produces a map always more full, and, generally, more accurate, than could have been obtained if he had chosen a wider field, and consequently a smaller scale. The essays on the use and abuse of political terms—on Irish disturbances, on the Irish in England, and on the government of dependencies,—are instances. None of these subjects had ever before been made the matter of an express treatise: some of them, such as ‘The Condition of the Irish in England,’ had scarcely been adverted to. In his hands they have all acquired importance. No future writer on any of the matters of which they form parts will disregard them, or will venture to treat them without adverting to the researches and opinions of Mr. Lewis. There is one great difference, however, between the territorial and the moral surveyor. A man may make a perfect map of a parish without having ever quitted it. His knowledge or his ignorance of the adjoining parishes or of the county is unimportant. No one can write well on any moral question without having thought much on all the questions that bear on it directly, and on many with which it appears to have little or no connection. The great variety of the matters into which Mr. Lewis, as a philosopher, has inquired, and of those with which, as an administrator and statesman, he has had to deal, contributes materially to the fulness and to the soundness of his special discussions.

Mr. J. S. Mill has remarked, that the least satisfactory parts of a treatise are generally the opening portions, in which the author sketches his subject and defines his principal terms; these being the most abstract parts of his work, and therefore those as to which he is most likely to be accused of confusion or impropriety, and indeed most likely to be guilty of them. The case before us is no exception. We are inclined to object both to the nomenclature and to the classification of the first chapter; and, as the subject is important, we shall state our objections at

some length. We will begin by extracting Mr. Lewis's opening sentences:—

‘As the ensuing Essay relates to matters of opinion, it will be necessary for me, at the outset, to explain briefly what portion of the subjects of belief is understood to be included under this appellation, and what is the meaning of the generally received distinction between matters of opinion and matters of fact.

By a matter of fact, I understand anything of which we obtain a conviction from our internal consciousness, or any individual event or phenomenon which is the object of sensation. It is true that even the simplest sensations involve some judgment. When a witness reports that he saw an object of a certain shape and size, or at a certain distance, he describes something more than a mere impression on his sense of sight; his statement implies a theory and explanation of the bare phenomenon. When, however, this judgment is of so simple a kind as to become wholly unconscious, and the interpretation of the appearances is a matter of general agreement, the object of sensation may, for our present purpose, be considered a fact. A fact, as so defined, must be limited to individual sensible objects, and not extended to general expressions or formulæ descriptive of classes of facts, or sequences of phenomena,—such as, that the blood circulates, the sun attracts the planets, and the like. Propositions of this sort—though descriptive of realities, and therefore, in one sense, of matters of fact—relate to large classes of phenomena which cannot be grasped by a single sensation, which can only be determined by a long series of observations, and are established by a process of intricate reasoning.

‘Taken in this sense, matters of fact are decided by an appeal to our own consciousness or sensation, or to the testimony, direct or indirect, of the original and percipient witnesses. Doubts, indeed, frequently arise as to the existence of a matter of fact, in consequence of the diversity of the reports made by the original witnesses, or the suspiciousness of their testimony. A matter of fact may, again, be doubtful in consequence of the different constructions which may be put upon admitted facts and appearances in a case of proof by (what is termed) circumstantial evidence. Whenever such doubts exist, they cannot be settled by a direct appeal to testimony, and can be resolved only by reasoning,—instances of which are afforded by the pleadings of lawyers and the disquisitions of historians upon contested facts. When an individual fact is doubted upon reasonable grounds, its existence becomes a matter of opinion.

‘Matters of opinion, not being disputed questions of fact, are general propositions relating to laws of nature or mind, principles and rules of human conduct, future probabilities, deductions from hypotheses, and the like, about which a doubt may reasonably exist. All doubtful questions, whether of speculation or practice, are matters of opinion. With regard to these, the ultimate source of our belief is always a process of reasoning.

‘The essential idea of opinion seems to be, that it is a matter about



which doubt can reasonably exist, as to which two persons can, without absurdity, think differently. The existence of an object before the eyes of two persons would not be a matter of opinion, nor would it be a matter of opinion that twice two are four. But when testimony is divided, or uncertain, the existence of a fact may become doubtful, and therefore a matter of opinion. For example, it may be a matter of opinion whether there was a war of Troy, whether Romulus lived, who was the Man in the Iron Mask, who wrote Junius, &c. So the tendency of a law or form of government, or social institution; the probability of a future event; the quality of an action, or the character of an historical personage,—may be a matter of opinion.

‘Any proposition the contrary of which can be maintained with probability, is a matter of opinion.’ \*

According to the last of these definitions, matter of opinion is opposed, not to matter of fact, but to matter of certainty. But according to an earlier definition, propositions which are established by a process of intricate reasoning,—such as the attraction of the planets by the sun,—however certain, are excluded from matters of fact, and therefore considered matters of opinion.

We believe that in common use, each of these expressions—matter of fact and matter of opinion—is ambiguous.

Sometimes we use the term matter of fact, as it is defined by Mr. Lewis, to mean an event or phenomenon which we know from consciousness of sensation. So used it is opposed to matter of inference. Thus the destructiveness of cholera is a matter of fact. The mode of its propagation a matter of inference. That the sun appears to go round the earth, is a matter of fact. That it is stationary, is a matter of inference. Sometimes, on the other hand, we use the term matter of fact to express, not the sort of evidence on which a proposition rests, but its certainty. In this sense of the word, matter of fact is opposed not to matter of inference, but to matter of doubt. Thus there would be no impropriety in calling the existence of a Deity a fact, though ascertained only by inference. In this sense the immobility of the sun might be called a fact.

A similar ambiguity belongs to the expression, matter of opinion.

Sometimes it denotes the knowledge acquired by inference as opposed to that acquired by perception. Thus we might say, that the moon gives light is a matter of fact; that it is uninhabited is matter of opinion. The redness of the blood is a fact; its circulation an opinion. The assassination of Cæsar

is a fact; the merit of that act an opinion. Sometimes, and more frequently, it denotes not inference, as opposed to perception, but uncertainty, as opposed to certainty. Thus, the death of Charles the First might be called a fact; his authorship of the 'Icon Basilike' an opinion. Both are matters which might have been ascertained by perception — but we are certain as to the one, and uncertain as to the other.

In this sense what is matter of fact in one age or in one place, may cease to be so in another. Among the Greeks it was a matter of fact that the sun goes round the earth: no one doubted it. Among us it is a fact that the earth goes round the sun. Three hundred years ago no one doubted that Cicero wrote the oration *pro Marcello*. It was therefore a matter of fact. Now the belief that it is spurious rather preponderates. Its authenticity, therefore, is now matter of opinion.

We are inclined to think that the best plan would be to discard from philosophical use both these ambiguous expressions, and to divide knowledge, according to its sources, into matter of perception and matter of inference; and, as a cross division, as to our conviction, into matter of certainty and matter of doubt.

Matters of perception are generally matters of certainty. Our senses sometimes deceive us, but it is seldom that we suspect the deception; and as certainty is an attribute, not of the things considered, but of the person who considers them, an unreal appearance, if its unreality be unsuspected, is not matter of doubt. Sometimes, indeed, we know that we do not see what we seem to ourselves to see. We know that a juggler does not put our watches into a gun, fire it off, and then return them to us unhurt. Yet it seems to us that we see him do so. So Maclaurin saw a phantom in the corner of his room. He sent for a surgeon, was bled, and, as the blood flowed, the phantom melted away.

Matters of inference, of course, vary from perfect certainty to the slightest suspicion. The inference, from all past experience, that the sun will rise to-morrow, is a matter of perfect certainty. The inference, from the apparent want of water and atmosphere in the moon, that it is uninhabited, is a matter of great doubt. The inference, drawn from the analogy of the earth, that the moon is inhabited by rational beings, is too doubtful to be seriously considered.

Mr. Lewis, of course, has a right to select his own nomenclature, provided he employ it consistently. We have seen that his last definition of a matter of opinion is, that it is a proposition the contradictory of which may be maintained with probability.

In the rest of this article, therefore, we shall consider him as using the expression 'matter of opinion' in this sense.

We proceed to his definition of authority in matters of opinion:—

'When any one forms an opinion on a question either of speculation or practice, without any appropriate process of reasoning really or apparently leading to that conclusion, and without compulsion or inducement of interest, but simply because some other persons, whom he believes to be competent judges on the matter, entertain that opinion, he is said to have formed his opinion upon authority.

'Whenever, in the course of this Essay, I speak of the Principle of Authority, I shall understand, the principle of adopting the belief of others, on a matter of opinion, without reference to the particular grounds on which that belief may rest.'\*

In the second chapter Mr. Lewis considers the extent of the opinions founded on authority. Of course this genus includes nearly all the opinions of children. It includes nearly all the opinions of the labouring classes. The traditional maxims which they inherit from their parents, the instruction communicated by their clergy, and the desultory information contained in the few books and newspapers which they read, form the basis of their knowledge.

Among the middle and higher orders many will not spare from business or pleasure the time necessary to form independent opinions on matters requiring laborious investigation. Others not only act, but think, under the dominion of fashion, and fear singularity more than error. And even those who are anxious for truth can seek it for themselves in only a few directions.

'A mathematician,' says Mr. Lewis, 'takes his historical and political opinions—a moral philosopher or an historian takes his physical opinions—on trust. The difficulty and labour of original thought and investigation are great. The number of subjects is enormous: every year adds to the stock of known facts, both in history and physics. The invention of printing and paper, by multiplying and perpetuating the records of facts and opinions, has rendered it impossible for even a professed student to explore more than certain portions of the field of knowledge.'† It was in the power of Aristotle both to know all that was known by others and to be a great discoverer himself. He was able to illustrate every subject by every other. A modern student has a choice of difficulties. If he concentrate his inquiries, he cannot shed over his own path the light which might have been reflected from other portions of

the universe of knowledge. And if, in search of this light, he wanders into bye paths, he wears out the strength and the time which are necessary to carry him far in his own peculiar course.

Having shown how large is the extent of the opinions adopted on authority, Mr. Lewis considers what are the marks of trustworthy testimony on matters of fact, and what are the qualifications of a competent guide in questions of speculative truth and practical conduct. This subject has, however, been exhausted by Archbishop Whately\*, and is therefore touched on very slightly by Mr. Lewis; and he proceeds to a less trodden matter,—the importance of the agreement in testimony or opinion of the persons whose qualifications give to them authority. We are inclined to think that he rather overrates the value of concurrent testimony as to matters of perception, when he says that if ten credible witnesses agree as to a fact, the value of their concurrent testimony is more than ten times the value of the testimony of each. Assuming the matter to be cognisable by the senses, and the observer to be judicious and honest, a single witness is, in most cases, as fully to be believed as ten. We say in most cases, in order to exclude the cases of delusions occasioned by disease. We believe many historical and still more numerous judicial facts, though they are attested by only a single witness. We do *not* believe that a juggler really does what he appears to do, though the fact is attested by a whole theatre. Archbishop Whately has well remarked† that what is called the concurrent testimony of hundreds is often, in fact, the testimony of one or two persons to what they have seen, or think that they have seen, and that of the rest to their belief in the thing having been seen by others. The whole army of Cortez declared that, at the battle of Otumba, they were led by the Apostle St. James. It is obvious that the error or the invention must have been begun by some one person, and that the others were mere repeaters of his story. The real advantage of plurality of witnesses is, that if they are dishonest they may be detected by separately cross-examining them as to details, as in the *cause célèbre* of Susannah and the Elders. Even this resource sometimes fails, when the witnesses are well drilled. In the Leigh peerage case, before the House of Lords, in 1828, the claimant proved his descent from one Roger Leigh, of Haigh, in Lancashire, and he affirmed that Roger Leigh was the son of Christopher

\* Rhetoric, pt. i. ch. 2.

† Ibid. p. 62., 7th edit.

Leigh, who was admitted to have been a son of the first Lord Leigh. It was known, however, that Christopher Leigh married one Constance Clent, and that the issue of that marriage had failed. The claimant's case was, that he had previously married a Cotton, and that Roger was the son of the first marriage. To prove this fifteen or sixteen witnesses swore that they recollected, in Stoneleigh Church, a monument to the Honourable Christopher Leigh, with an inscription which, when put together out of their different recollections, stated that his first wife was a Cotton; that he had by her a son named Roger, who was described as of some place in Lancashire, and who married a Higham. In short, the inscription supplied all the wanting links; and they recollected that when the church was repaired, in 1811, the monument was removed, and never replaced. They supported their evidence by minute details. One witness used to wonder that a Leigh should marry so low a person as a Cotton, since his father had a servant of that name. Another used to be puzzled how the letters Leigh could produce the sound of Lee. Another used to ponder how Higham could be pronounced Hiam. They varied a little as to the colour and form of the monument, but all agreed that it contained the words, 'The Honourable Christopher Leigh,' 'Cotton,' 'Roger,' 'Lancashire,' and 'Higham,' and all agreed that it stated Roger to have been the son of Christopher. One witness was accustomed to work in the church, and always put his tools behind this monument. Another had been employed to clean it; another saw it in the vestry, after it was taken down; another assisted a man to copy the inscription, who fell while doing so, and hurt himself; another was churchwarden when the monument was taken down, and remonstrated against its not being put up again; another saw it carried into a cellar in Stoneleigh Abbey, from whence it never emerged. And yet it was proved, to the satisfaction of all who heard and of all who have read the evidence, that such a monument never did exist, and never could have existed, since all the material statements of the pretended inscription were shown to be unfounded.

Mr. Lewis thus sums up the progress of agreement in matters of inference:—

'When any science is in an imperfect but constantly advancing state, the weight of authority increases as the tendency to agreement begins to exhibit itself; as the lines of independent thought converge; as rival opinions coalesce under a common banner; as sects expire; as national schools, and modes of thought and expression disappear; as the transmission of erroneous and unverified opinions from one

generation to another is interrupted by the recognition of newly ascertained truths. It is by the gradual diminution of points of difference, and by the gradual increase of points of agreement, among men of science, that they acquire the authority which accredits their opinions, and propagates scientific truths. In general, it may be said that the authority of the professors of any science is trustworthy, in proportion as the points of agreement among them are numerous and important, and the points of difference few and unimportant.\*

These judicious remarks are followed by a passage, which we extract, partly because its general propositions are valuable, and partly because we think ourselves bound to enter a protest against some of the examples by which those general propositions are illustrated.

‘ Assistance in the selection of guides to opinion may be derived from a consideration of the marks of imposture or charlatanism in respect both to science and practice. If such marks can be found, they will afford an additional means of distinguishing mock sciences from true ones,—the charlatan from the true philosopher or sound practitioner.

‘ In the first place, we may observe. that mock sciences are rejected, after a patient examination and study of facts, and not upon a hasty first impression, by the general agreement of competent judges. Such was the case with astrology, magic, and divination of all sorts, at the beginning of the last century; which, having been reduced to a systematic form, and received by the general credulity, have since yielded to the light of reason. The errors of the ancients in natural history, which were repeated by subsequent writers after the revival of letters, have been exploded by a similar process. The same may be said of the influence of the heavenly bodies upon diseases, believed at no distant date by scientific writers. Mesmerism, homœopathy, and phrenology have now been before the world a sufficient time to be fairly and fully examined by competent judges; and as they have not stood the test of impartial scientific investigation, and therefore have not established themselves in professional opinion, they may be safely, on this ground alone, set down under the head of mock sciences; though, as in the case of alchemy, the researches to which they give rise, and the new hypotheses which they promulgate, may assist in promoting genuine science.

‘ True sciences establish themselves, after a time, and acquire a recognised position in all civilised countries. Moreover, they connect themselves with other true sciences; analogies and points of contact between the new truths formerly known are perceived. Such has been the case with geology, which has taken its place as a science founded on accurate and extensive observation only during the present century. But while it has assumed an independent position, it has received great assistance from comparative anatomy and other

apparently unconnected sciences, and has thrown light upon them in return.

'Pseudo-sciences, on the other hand, are not accredited by the consentient reception of professional judges, but remain in an equivocal and unaccepted state. No analogies or affiliations with genuine sciences are discovered; the new comer continues an alien, unincorporated with the established scientific system; if any connexion is attempted to be proved, it is with another spurious science, as in the case of phreno-mesmerism, where one delusion is supported by another. Mock sciences again, not making their way universally, are sometimes confined to a particular nation, or, at all events, to a limited body of sectarians who stand aloof from the professors of the established science.'\*

We have said that we assent to the general views contained in this passage, but not to all its specific illustrations. We do not think that mesmerism, homœopathy, and phrenology have all failed under the test of impartial scientific investigation. We do not think that this can be fairly asserted of any one of them. There are now probably in England, France, Germany, and the United States, many hundred educated men who are professedly practitioners of homœopathy. The majority of them were originally trained to believe in the doctrines and pursue the practice of ordinary medicine, or, as the homœopaths have denominated it, allopathy. Can there be a doubt that among them there are many who are competent judges, and who have subjected homœopathy to an impartial scientific investigation, and who believe that it has stood the test? They may be wrong in this belief, but they stake on it their own reputations and the health and lives of their patients. Again, the literature on phrenology amounts in bulk to a respectable library. It contains elaborate treatises by men of scientific habits, who had no motives to deceive themselves or the public. We do not affirm that their conclusions are generally acquiesced in; but we do affirm that they have not been generally rejected. The truth of the phrenological theory may not have been established, but it has not been proved to be false.

Both homœopathy and phrenology are plausible. They are supported by analogy. The homœopathist affirms that much of what we call disease is in fact a curative process. That the acceleration of the pulse, for instance, in fever, is an effort of nature to escape from a mischievous influence; that it resembles the plunges of a horse who falls under his load, and struggles, as it appears to us wildly, to recover himself. And he asks whether, if we were to consider the horse's struggles as the thing

to be remedied, and violently to repress them, we should do good or harm? He affirms that his remedies, though they may exaggerate the symptoms, may by that very process relieve the disease, those symptoms being in fact the mode of cure; and that it is because they assist nature instead of opposing her, that they are efficient, though exhibited in comparatively minute doses. It is obvious that there are many cases to which this reasoning will not apply, and that the curative process employed by nature may be one that ought to be checked rather than encouraged. Nature, for instance, cures inflammation by supuration, ulceration, and cicatrisation. She does this blindly: in the lungs as readily as in the other parts of the body; and as ulcerated lungs rarely heal, the patient dies under her practice. Still, however, the homœopathic reasoning is generally plausible; and we are inclined to believe that in many cases its inferences are true.

The basis of the phrenological theory is the hypothesis that, as the brain collectively is the organ of thought and feeling, so portions of the brain are employed in producing specific intellectual and moral results. That as we see with our eyes, hear with our ears, and taste with our palates, so the organs of thought are principally in the front, and those of passion principally in the back of the head; that the portions of the brain which supply combativeness and destructiveness are behind the ears, and those which are used in veneration on the crown. It is possible that even the outline of this doctrine may not be true. It is not only possible, but probable, that there may be error in many of the details of the science as taught by its most accomplished professors; but it appears to us that to affirm its utter fabulousness is more rash than even to maintain its universal truth.

Mesmerism certainly is *not* plausible. That it should be in the power of the mesmeriser, without actual contact, merely by gesticulation and by an exertion of will, to produce in his patient the trance which, in the language of the science, is called somnambulism; that the somnambulist should lose his general perception of the exterior world, should not hear the conversation around him, should not feel pressure from external bodies, should endure, without pain, a surgical operation, but should receive new powers of perception with respect to those with whom he is put into what they call relation, should read their thoughts, see the state of their internal organs, detect in them any disorder, and know instinctively what are its appropriate remedies,—all these are phenomena for which we are unprepared by any previous experience. They are not, to use



a common word in its derivative sense, likely. They do not resemble anything that we have previously known. We ought not to admit them, except on proof, more than sufficient to support propositions supported by analogy. But it is impossible to deny that to many men of high moral and scientific character the proofs already adduced have appeared sufficient. Nor is it, we think, to be denied that this number is increasing, and that mesmerism is assuming an importance which must, at no distant time, occasion a formal inquiry, in which its errors, which probably are many, will be separated from, what we may be sure are also many, its truths.

We cannot quit this episode without supporting our views by the authority of a writer whose knowledge and ability none of our readers will undervalue.

In his 'Sequel to the Outlines of Medical Proof,' Dr. Mayo urges with great force the expediency of an inquiry, either by the College of Physicians, or under a government commission, into the merits of homœopathy, hydropathy, and mesmerism. The following is a portion of his argument:—

'The position of mesmerism, with respect to the public, demands not jesting and abuse, but very serious consideration. The reality of those phenomena of trance which have been brought to bear upon the treatment of disease, and the removal of physical pain, is undeniable, however disposed we may be to exercise a chronic scepticism with respect to certain other transcendental phenomena of the mesmeric state. With respect to mesmeric therapeutics, besides other questions which would spring out of an inquiry, one question would arise of a very practical nature; namely, whether a certain measure of beneficial results being conceded to mesmerism, the extent of benefit is commensurate with the contingent mischievousness of the means employed. Now the public has a right to demand, and to demand of us, some answer to the questions, whether the asserted removal of disorders on mesmeric principles has been truly effected—whether the objections above hinted at to their removal on these principles may be overruled—whether, in regard to this latter point, a line can be drawn between a legitimate and an illegitimate use of the expedients of the science.

'For great, indeed, is the curative effect held out by these practitioners, and held out with no slight degree of proof. The talents and high scientific position of Dr. Elliotson are well known. It would be superfluous, and therefore impertinent, to say that his veracity is unimpeachable, but for the unpurposeness with which charges of insincerity have been brought

‘ against professors of mesmerism. Now Dr. Elliotson has recently published a case of cancer, apparently absorbed under mesmeric treatment. Its cancerous nature had been recognised by Mr. Syme, Mr. Samuel Cooper, and Dr. Ashburner, as well as by Dr. Elliotson. But, in fact, the cases of cure, less marvellous in kind than this, of various diseases under mesmeric agency, are too numerous to be put aside without inquiry. They are numerous to an extent which will induce the public to accept the *methodus medendi*, with all its presumable evils, unless we place it before them, after investigation, in a harmless form, if such a form can be devised, or convict the whole system of vice or imposture.

‘ An inquiry of this kind may no doubt terminate only in incertitude. In this case, if the requisite means have been taken to elicit truth, and to secure ourselves against error, we shall at least have done our duty. But it is conceivable, with respect to homœopathy, that as disease can arise from infinitesimal causes, so infinitesimal remedies may sometimes prove sanative; it is conceivable, with respect to mesmerism, that the influence of the trance, and of the sympathy, may be admitted by us to possess an extent of medical advantage, which may exceed the disadvantage of the peculiar kind of possession involved in this treatment.’\*

Dr. Elliotson has all the qualities which Mr. Lewis requires† in an unexceptionable witness to a matter of perception. The facts, so far as they were matters of perception, fell within the range of his senses; he attended to them; he possesses a fair amount of intelligence and memory; and he is free from any sinister or misleading interest. His interest, indeed, would have led him to conceal almost all that he has told; for his connexion with mesmerism gave to his reputation a taint of quackery, which, for a time, materially injured his practice. He has also all the rarer qualities which Mr. Lewis requires in a competent authority in matters of inference‡, — talents, learning, experience, and integrity. If his evidence and his opinions are to be scornfully rejected because he relates phenomena which are not supported by analogical facts, how is the existence of such phenomena to be proved? Are we to adopt the pyrrhonism which maintains that it is more probable that any amount of testimony should be false than that any thing differing from what we believe to be the ordinary course of nature should have occurred? On such principles the King of Siam was justified in disbelieving that water can become

---

\* Sequel, pp. 37—40.

† P. 21.

‡ P. 27.

solid; and the Emperor of China might refuse to be convinced that it is possible to send a message from Peking to Canton in a second.

Since these remarks were written we have received two papers from Calcutta. One is a 'Report of the Committee appointed by Government to observe and report upon surgical operations by Dr. J. Esdaile upon patients under alleged mesmeric agency;' printed by the Government in 1846. The other is a 'Record of Cases treated in the Mesmeric Hospital, from November, 1846, to May, 1847,' with reports of the official visitors; printed by the Government in 1847.

Some of the diseases prevalent in India require operations longer and more painful than almost any that are endured in Europe. Dr. Esdaile, the superintendent of a hospital near Calcutta, had for some time prepared his patients by throwing them into mesmeric sleep. Lord Dalhousie, anticipating Dr. Mayo's suggestion, appointed a committee (or, as we should call it, a commission), consisting of seven persons, four of whom were medical men, to report on this practice. An apartment in the native hospital of Calcutta was assigned as the scene of the experiment, and ten patients as its subjects.

The Committee thus describe the process, and its results:—

'The mesmeriser was seated behind the patient, leaning over him, the right hand generally placed on the pit of the stomach, and passes were made with one or both hands along the face, chiefly over the eyes. The mesmeriser breathed frequently and gently over the patient's lips, eyes, and nostrils. Profound silence was observed. These processes were continued for about two hours in each day. In three cases no result was obtained. In seven cases, in a period varying from one to seven sittings, deep sleep followed. This sleep in its most perfect state differed from ordinary natural sleep as follows: The individual could not be aroused by loud noises, the pupils were insensible to light, and great, and in some cases apparently perfect, insensibility to pain was witnessed on burning, pinching, and cutting the skin and other sensitive organs. It differed from that which would be produced by narcotic drugs in the quickness with which, in eight cases out of ten, the patient was awoke, after certain transverse passes and fanning by the mesmeriser, and blowing upon the face and on the eyes,—in the natural condition of the pupils of the eyes and the conjunctiva in all the cases after awaking,—in the absence of stertorous breathing and of subsequent delirium or hallucination; and of many other symptoms familiar to medical observers, which are produced by alcoholic liquors, opium,

‘hemp, and other narcotic drugs. In seven cases surgical operations were performed in the state of sleep above described. In the case of Nilmony Dutt there was not the slightest indication of the operation having been felt by the patient. It consisted in the removal of a tumour. It lasted four minutes. The patient’s hands or legs were not held. He did not move or groan, or his countenance change. And when awoke after the operation, he declared he had no recollection of what had occurred. In another case, Hyder Khan, an emaciated man, suffering from mortification of the leg, amputation of the thigh was performed, and no sign of its causing pain was evinced. In a third case, Murali Doss (the operation he underwent being very severe), he moved his body and arms, breathing in gasps, but his countenance underwent little change, and the features expressed no suffering; and on awaking he declared he knew of nothing having been done to him during his sleep. In a fourth case the operation was insignificant. In the three other cases various phenomena were witnessed, which require to be specially pointed out. While the patients did not open their eyes, or utter articulate sounds, or require to be held, there were vague and convulsive movements of the upper limbs, writhing of the body, distortion of the features, giving the face a hideous expression of suppressed agony; the respiration became heaving, with deep sighs. There were, in short, all the signs of intense pain which a dumb person undergoing an operation might be expected to exhibit, *except resistance to the operator*. But in all these cases, without exception, after the operation was completed, the patients expressed no knowledge or recollection of what had occurred, denied having dreamed, and complained of no pain till their attention was directed to the place where the operation had been performed.’\*

On receiving this report the Governor-General, ‘believing,’ in the words of Mr. Halliday, his secretary, ‘that the possibility of rendering the most serious operations painless had been so far established as to render it incumbent on the Government to assist in the inquiry, determined to place Dr. Esdaile for one year in charge of a small experimental hospital in some favourable situation in Calcutta, in order that he might extend his investigations under the inspection of official visitors.’

The second paper contains the results of the first six months of this experiment. It appears that during that time a series of operations were performed on patients in mesmeric sleep. Dr. Esdaile states that in seven of the cases in which he operated, the

---

\* Report, pp. 2, 3.

patients recovered consciousness before the end of the operation. In all the others their sleep endured until they were intentionally roused after its termination, and they were then unaware of what had been done to them. In many of them, however, there were indications of pain during its continuance. Three of these last-mentioned cases are detailed by Professor O'Shaugnessy, one of the official visitors. They left on his mind, he says, an unfavourable impression. 'But,' he continues, 'I have witnessed 'so many cases operated upon by Dr. Esdaile since, without 'the patients showing the slightest physical or other indication 'of suffering, either before, during, or immediately after the 'operation, that I am perfectly satisfied that they did not feel 'pain any more than the bed they lay upon, or the knife that 'cut them.'\*

No one can doubt that phenomena like these deserve to be observed, recorded, and arranged; and whether we call by the name of Mesmerism, or by any other name, the science which proposes to do this, is a mere question of nomenclature. Among those who profess this science there may be careless observers, prejudiced recorders, and rash systematisers; their errors and defects may impede the progress of knowledge, but they will not stop it. And we have no doubt that before the end of this century, the wonders which now perplex almost equally those who accept and those who reject modern mesmerism, will be distributed into defined classes, and found subject to ascertained laws; in other words, will become the subjects of a science.

Having described, in the third chapter, the process by which, in scientific matters, an agreement among competent judges, and, consequently, a body of trustworthy authority, is gradually formed, Mr. Lewis proceeds, in the fourth, to consider how far this description applies to matters of religion.

All nations and in all ages have agreed in the belief of the existence of a supernatural power. Nearly all nations, and nearly all ages, have agreed in believing in the existence of One Supreme God; sometimes believed to be sole, but more frequently supposed to be accompanied by other gods, or by beings, like the Mother of God among the Roman Catholics, partially endued with divine attributes. All the civilised nations of the modern world, or, to speak more correctly, all the nations whose agreement on a matter of opinion is of any real weight and authority, agree in believing in some form of Christianity. Nor is there much dispute among Christians as

---

\* Report, Appendix, p. iii.

to the moral doctrines of Christianity. Mr. Lewis mentions the degree of affinity within which marriage may be contracted, and the lawfulness of its dissolution, as the only material points of difference. The necessity, for salvation, of some particular opinions, and the lawfulness of persecution, might also, perhaps, be considered as exceptions. It may be said that these last-mentioned views are generally abandoned by Protestants and retained by the Church of Rome. The fact, however, is, that both among Protestants and Roman Catholics these views are retained in formularies of belief and doctrine, but rejected by the enlightened portion of the public. The opinion that mis-believers (miscreants, as our Norman ancestors called them) may be saved, is a modern innovation, and so is the opinion that the magistrate ought not (to use the words of our own Liturgy) to maintain truth; — that is to say, to repress error by punishment, or, at least, by exclusions and disabilities. The Church of Rome, to which the claim of infallibility is like a coat of mail — a prison as well as a defence, — cannot openly repudiate these doctrines. But the belief in them of its enlightened members is no greater than that of enlightened Protestants.

But though there is a general concurrence throughout the civilised world as to the correctness of the historical outline of Christianity, and as to its moral doctrines, there is no tendency to concurrence as to its metaphysical dogmata, or as to the positive forms by which the ministers of a Christian Church ought to be governed and appointed, or, in other words, as to Church discipline. Of these questions the former class more affect the imagination; the latter, the judgment. It is only in peculiar states of mind that people take a deep interest in the former; the latter are too practical to be ever disregarded.

When we treat of the relation of the Father to the Son, of the procession of the Holy Spirit, or of the compatibility of Unity and Trinity, we engage in inquiries attractive from their vastness and their obscurity, but without any influence on the actions of man. In considering whether the Church ought to be governed by bishops or by presbyters, — whether lay nomination, ecclesiastical selection, or popular election be the best mode of appointing ministers, — we discuss important political institutions.

But neither the one class of questions nor the other seems to be susceptible of a perfect solution.

Questions of Church government, being political questions, are affected by circumstances of time and place. Different forms may be useful in the same society at different periods, and in different societies at the same period. One arrangement

may suit a monarchy, another an aristocracy, and another a democracy. Much may depend on the degree of secular education among the people; much more on their moral habits and on their religious knowledge. No one can believe that the Free Church would work as well in Sicily or in Poland as it does in Scotland or in the United States; or that the private patronage which gives to England a parochial clergy, in many respects excellent, could be tolerated in France.

Such institutions, too, offer only a choice of advantages, and consequently also a choice of evils. Some peculiar merits and some peculiar inconveniences attach to every arrangement. One system may produce an aristocratic clergy, connected with the higher orders by birth, fortune, and education, bringing into the church larger incomes than they derive from it, liberalised by general literature and foreign travel, influencing the aristocracy because they live with it, influencing the lower classes by their superiority of learning, position, and fortune, and still more by their patronage and charities; the centres, among the rural gentry, of refinement and civilisation, but never mixing familiarly with their inferiors, neither partaking their pleasures, nor contributing, by contact, to the improvement of their manners. Another system may send out a clergy drawn from the lower orders, acquainted with their habits and wants, sympathising with their feelings, living in their society, joining in their amusements, just sufficiently raised above them to inspire respect without awe, and to elevate, by conversation and example, their moral and intellectual standard; but, at the same time, excluded, by birth, fortune, and manners, from the society of the gentry; never influencing or attempting to influence their opinions or conduct, and treated by them, like the village farrier or the village schoolmaster, as useful and respectable inferiors.

Doctrinal questions, on the other hand, seem unsusceptible of general agreement, not from the abundance, but from the want, of premises. The arguments by which different sects defend their tenets consist mainly of texts of Scripture, which must be susceptible of various interpretations, since they actually receive various interpretations. With no facts to refer to, and no umpire to interpose his authority, the wrestlers waste whole lives in eventless struggles, neither party having any fulcrum by which he can lift the other.

'We may discern,' says Mr. Lewis, 'a certain analogy between the perpetuation of a particular form of Christianity and the perpetuation of a particular language. Both belong to a class of which the forms are various; but each variety, having once arisen, is unchanging,

and, when adopted by a nation, remains. Both prevail locally, and are transmitted, by a faithful tradition, from father to son, and both are diffused by colonisation and conquest.\*

'The practical deduction from these results,' he adds, 'seems to be, that the mere authority of any church or sect cannot, of itself, command assent to its distinctive and peculiar tenets while the present divisions of Christendom continue; and that a person, born in a Christian country, can with propriety adopt only one of two alternatives; viz., either to adhere to the faith of his parents and predecessors, and that of the church in which he has been educated; or, to form his own judgment as to the choice of his sect by means of the best independent investigation which his understanding and opportunities for study enable him to make.†

There is one circumstance which, in England, impairs authority in matters of religion, to which Mr. Lewis has not adverted. It is the state of English law and English opinion on infidelity.

Christianity, we are told, is parcel of the law of England; and therefore to 'write against Christianity in general,' to use the words of Holt, or 'to impugn the Christian religion generally,' in those of Lord Kenyon, or 'to impeach the established faith,' or to endeavour to unsettle the belief of others,' in those of Justice Bayley, is a misdemeanour at common law, and subjects the offender, at the discretion of the court, to fine, imprisonment, and infamous corporal punishment. The statute law is rather less vague. By the 9 & 10 Will. III. cap. 32., whoever, having been educated a Christian, shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the persons in the Holy Trinity to be God, or assert that there are more Gods than one, or deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine authority, shall, for the first offence, be incapable of holding any office or place of trust, civil or military, and for the second, be imprisoned for three years, and be incapable of suing in any court of law or equity, or of accepting any gift or legacy. The punishment for denying the doctrine of the Trinity was repealed in our own times; but the remainder of the statute is in full force at this day. It is true that, in these times, neither the common law nor the statute is likely to be enforced against a sober, temperate disputant. The publisher of the translation of Strauss has not been punished. But his safety is precarious. If any one were so ill-advised as to prosecute him, he must be convicted of libel, unless the jury should think fit to save him



at the expense of perjury; and we doubt whether the court would venture to inflict on him a mere nominal sentence.

But the repression of infidelity by law is far less formidable than that which is exercised by public opinion. The author of a work professedly and deliberately denying the truth of Christianity, would become a Pariah in the English world. If he were in a profession, he would find his practice fall off; if he turned towards the public service, its avenues would be barred. In society he would find himself shunned or scorned,—even his children would feel the taint of their descent. To be suspected of holding infidel opinions, though without any attempt at their propagation,—even without avowing them, is a great misfortune. It is an imputation which every prudent man carefully avoids. Under such circumstances, what reliance can an Englishman place on the authority of the writers who profess to have examined into the matter, and to have ascertained the truth? Can he say, ‘Their premises and conclusions are before the public. If there were any flaw in them it would be detected and exposed’? The errors committed or supposed to be committed by writers on the evidences of Christianity, may be detected, but there is little chance of their being exposed. It may perhaps be safe sometimes to impugn a false premise, or an unwarranted inference, but never to deny a conclusion. It is dangerous, indeed, to assert on religious matters any views with which the public is not familiar. There are probably few more strictly orthodox divines than Bishop Hampden. But he ventured to trace to the schoolmen some theological dogmas which prevail in a large portion of the Christian world, and much of the theological terminology which prevails every where. Such a novelty raised among his clerical brethren a storm of indignation, which broke through all bounds—not only of sense, or moderation, or reason, but even of law,—and induced the University of Oxford to assail him with a *privilegium*, and dignitaries of the Church to push their opposition till they incurred the penalties of a *præmunire*. An individual less firm than Dr. Hampden, or a statesman less resolute than Lord John Russell, would have been carried away by the torrent. To which of its members is the Church—or indeed the country—more indebted than to Archbishop Whately? Who has done so much to explain the doctrines, enforce the precepts, and establish and popularise the evidences of Christianity? But because he ventured to deny that the fourth commandment is still binding, and reminded his logical pupils that the word *persona* means not an individual, but a character, he is believed by thousands to be ‘a dangerous man.’ It is to this immunity from criticism that we owe the rash

assumption of premises, and the unwarranted inferences with which many theological writings abound. Facts and arguments are passed from author to author, which in secular matters would be dissipated in the blaze of free discussion. Theological literature, at least the portion of it which relates to the doctrines which 'are parcel of the common law,'—has been a protected literature; and much of its offspring has the rickety distorted form which belongs to the unhappy bantlings that have been swaddled by protection.

To this state of things we owe the undue importance given to the few avowedly infidel books which actually appear. They are like the political libels which creep out in a despotism. Their authors are supposed to be at least sincere, since they peril reputation and fortune. What could have given popularity to 'the Nemesis of Faith,' but the persecution of its author? To this also we owe the insidious form in which infidelity is usually insinuated,—intermixed with professions of orthodoxy and conveyed by a hint or a sneer. If Gibbon could have ventured, in simple and express terms, to assert his disbelief in Christianity, all his *persiflage* would have been omitted; and the reader, especially the young reader, would have known that his anti-Christian opinions were the attacks of an enemy—not the candid admissions of a friend. To this also we owe much of the scepticism which exists among educated Englishmen; using the word scepticism in its derivative sense—to express not incredulity, but doubt. They have not the means of making a real independent examination of the evidences of their faith. A single branch of that vast inquiry, if not aided by taking on trust the results handed down by previous inquirers, would occupy all the leisure which can be spared from a business or a profession. All that they think they have time for is to read a few popular treatises. But they know that these treatises have not been subjected to the ordeal of unfettered criticism. As little can they infer the truth of the established doctrine from the apparent acquiescence of those around them. They know that they may be surrounded by unbelieving conformists. And thus they pass their lives in scepticism,—in a state of indecision,—suspecting that what they have been taught may contain a mixture of truth and error which they are unable to decompose. If a balance could be struck between the infidelity that is prevented, and the infidelity that is occasioned, by the absence of free discussion, we have no doubt that the latter would greatly predominate.

The fifth chapter, 'On the Utility and proper Province of 'Authority,' is divided into two portions, of unequal import-

ance. With respect to the first portion—the utility of authority, we have little to say. It contains nothing to which we object, and opens views of little into which we desire to penetrate further. Perhaps, the only point adverted to which we wish Mr. Lewis had treated more fully is, — the auricular confession of the Church of Rome. He seems to think that the objections to that practice arise from its abuse or ill-directed exercise by the confessor.

‘The confessor,’ he says, ‘may be considered as a vicarious conscience, in like manner as professional advice is vicarious prudence. If the penitent makes a full and true confession, the confessor, or spiritual director, pronounces or advises with a complete knowledge of the circumstances of the case,—probably with a knowledge of the penitent’s character and position, and always with the impartiality of a judge,—free from personal concern in the matter, and unbiassed by passion or interest. Seeing how blind and partial a judge each man is in his own case, and how unconsciously the moral judgment with respect to our own actions is perverted by the inclinations, it cannot be doubted that such a counsellor, in ambiguous cases of conduct,—such a *ductor dubitanti*,—would be generally beneficial, if the moral code which he administers was well framed, and if his opinion or advice was always honest and enlightened. Unfortunately, however, it happens that the system of moral rules which guides the discretion of the Catholic confessor is founded on a narrow-minded and somewhat superstitious theology, so far as it proceeds upon the distinctive tenets of the Church of Rome; and that the desire of domestic dictation, and of regulating the affairs of families, natural in an unmarried clergy, gives, too often, an improper bias to the influence of the spiritual director.’\*

Now we believe that, even in the hands of an honest and enlightened confessor, compulsory confession,—that is to say, a confession in which the penitent is not allowed to select the matters on which he wishes for advice, but is bound, under the threat of incurring mortal sin, to tell every action, every wish, and every thought,—with all its advantages, which are very great,—is, on the whole, productive of a largely preponderating amount of evil. The great objection to it is, that it creates a new sin,—a sin of which a Protestant cannot be guilty, and a sin to which those whose consciences it will affect most mischievously are peculiarly exposed. We can suppose a person so insensible as to be able, without deep humiliation, to stand in mental nakedness before his priest. But a man with such coarse feelings is not likely to have a sensitive conscience. Gross, palpable sins are all that his memory is likely to accuse

him of. He confesses them, performs his penance, and obtains absolution; and the only evil is, the fear that the sin which has been so easily wiped out may be repeated,—an evil which a resolute and sagacious confessor may generally prevent by aggravating the severity of the penance. But persons, especially females, of shrinking delicacy of thought and feeling, are likely to be both curious in detecting their own mental improprieties, and averse to exposing them. Every attendance at the confessional must be a struggle between shame and duty. If duty prevail, we cannot but suspect that it must be at the expense of brushing off the bloom of the mind. We cannot think that every secret thought can be revealed without familiarising the revealer with ideas which might have passed through the brain without a trace, if attention had not been called to them. If shame prevail, a mortal sin is committed under circumstances peculiarly formidable. It is committed deliberately, before the shrine, while the idea of God is present to the sinner's mind; and it is unabsolved. The feeling of such a sin is likely to drive the timid into religious madness, and to induce the bold to take refuge in infidelity. We know that, in Roman Catholic countries, the necessity of confession is one of the obstacles to a religious life. 'I do not go to church,' we have been told, 'because I do not communicate; and I cannot communicate, because I cannot bear to confess.' According to the Roman Catholic creed, such a state of life is one of mortal sin. Those who indulge in it, therefore, must hope that that creed is false, at least in this respect. It is seldom, however, that a person, bred a Roman Catholic, believes his creed to be only partially erroneous. The Church instantly loses her infallible authority. With that authority fall numerous articles, both of faith and practice, which have no other support. A man with a strong predisposition to religious emotions (in the language of the phrenologists, with a powerful organ of veneration,) may stop himself on this inclined plane, catch hold of Scripture, and, like our ancestors, adopt Protestant opinions. But such instances are rare in this sceptical century. In the present state of public feeling, few that abandon Roman Catholicism rest short of deism.

The latter part of this chapter—that which considers the proper province of authority—recurs, in some measure, to the subject of the third chapter,—'The Marks of Trustworthy Authority.' In matters of science and of practical deliberation, the best of such marks is what Mr. Lewis terms the power to predict, but what we rather call the power to infer the unknown from the known. As we instinctively believe that there is no

effect without a cause, and that no cause can exist without producing its appropriate effect, it follows that a being of perfect knowledge can predict all that will happen, and for ever. In some portions of astronomy, and in some portions of chemical and mechanical science, our knowledge is perfect. We can calculate what will be the position of many of the heavenly bodies, at a given minute, twenty years or two hundred years hence. We know what phenomena will be exhibited by the chemical compounds which have been already tried. We can tell in how many minutes a given force will draw a given train from London to Exeter.

‘Extensive, however,’ says Mr. Lewis, ‘as our command over nature has become, and wide as is the domain of the useful arts, still every fresh invention, whether mechanical or chemical, is of uncertain success until it has been verified by actual trial and experiment. It is almost as difficult to predict the working of a new machine, as of a new law or social institution. When the problem is simple, calculation can master it; but when the elements are numerous and complex, and when we are not sure that all the influencing circumstances are included, the result is uncertain, and requires verification by experiment in physics as well as politics.’\*

Mr. Lewis proceeds to consider, separately, two cases with respect to the determination of the future in human affairs: one, when—from a view of all the circumstances which, taken in their aggregate, constitute the actual state of any country—we predict its state at any definite future period: the other, when, from the same premises, we predict the effects of some given cause;—the results, for instance, of giving to the peasantry of a semi-barbarous country a right to out-door relief; or the results of an attack upon Austria by Piedmont. On the approximation to accuracy of predictions in the latter class depend legislation and foreign policy. The instances of failure in both; the cases in which legislation has aggravated the evils which it was intended to remedy, and has introduced others unexperienced before; the cases in which a foreign policy, of which the aim was peace, has produced war; and one which aimed at aggrandisement has ended in ruin,—show, from their number and their universality, that in no age and in no country has the approximation to accuracy been considerable. There are, probably, no great countries in Europe whose foreign policy during the last two hundred years has not produced, even to themselves, much more harm than good; and yet the last two hundred years are the most enlightened period that the world

has ever seen. In every country in Europe the principal obstacles to improvement are existing laws. The glory of the Duke of Wellington's administration was the repeal of the laws against Roman Catholics,—that of Lord Melbourne's was the repeal of the greater part of the then existing Poor Law,—that of Sir Robert Peel's, the repeal of the Corn Laws,—that of the present Government is the repeal of the Navigation Laws. We wish that Mr. Lewis had given to us one of his comprehensive sketches of the subjects, on which statesmen are most likely to err in their internal and in their external policy. Such a sketch might serve the purpose of the posts marked dangerous, which the Humane Society erects on the treacherous portions of the ice on the Serpentine. It would say avoid these matters, or skim lightly over them. '*Le précipice est sous la glace.*'

As a proof of the difficulty of foreseeing the political results of a given act, it has been remarked that scarcely any assassination, or judicial murder, has produced the results contemplated by its perpetrators. The death of Cæsar did not give freedom to Rome,—the murder of Becket did not weaken the Papal power in England,—the execution of Charles I. merely changed an elderly and imprisoned king into a young and free one,—the execution of Louis XVI. did not strengthen the French Republic,—that of the Duc d'Enghien did not strengthen Bonaparte,—that of Ney did not strengthen Louis XVIII. All these crimes, and almost all similar crimes, have produced results not only different from those which were intended, but opposed to them.

The other class of predictions,—those which attempt to infer from the present state of any country what will be its condition at a given period,—Mr. Lewis treats with little respect.

'Such anticipations,' he says, 'even of the most sagacious judges, can have scarcely better claim to confidence than the predictions of a weather almanack. For example, who, in the year 1788, could have predicted the social and political state of France and a large part of Europe at any period of the Revolution, the Consulate, or the Empire? And even if he had then predicted the great development of popular and military energy which ensued in France upon the invasion of the French territory, and the attempts to restore the royal authority, his prediction must have been founded on such uncertain and arbitrarily chosen grounds as to deserve little more than the name of a guess. Who, in January, 1848, could have predicted the series of events which have occurred on the continent of Europe since that period? and who, if he had happened to conjecture something near the truth, could have ventured to say that his prediction was derived from sure data?'

Mr. Lewis's illustrations cannot perhaps be said to be opposed to his conclusions, but they are not very favourable to them. The two important events which were imminent in 1788 and 1848, were the two great French revolutions. And both were predicted. On the 25th of December, 1753, when no revolution had disturbed Europe for nearly one hundred years, Lord Chesterfield thus wrote to his son:—‘Wherever you are, inform yourself minutely of, and attend particularly to, the affairs of France. They grow more serious, and in my opinion, will grow more and more so every day. The people are poor, consequently discontented; those who have religion are divided in their notions of it, which is saying that they hate one another. The clergy never do forgive; much less will they forgive the Parliaments. The Parliaments never will forgive them. The army must without doubt take, in their own minds at least, different parts in all these disputes, which, upon occasion, will break out. Armies, though always the supporters and tools of absolute power for the time being, are always the destroyers of it too, by frequently changing the hands in which they think proper to lodge it. The French nation reasons freely, which they never did before, upon matters of religion and government, and begin to be *sprejudicati*; the officers do so too: in short, all the symptoms which I have ever met with in history, previous to great changes and revolutions in government, now exist, and daily increase, in France.’

In January, 1848, to ordinary eyes, the Orleans' dynasty appeared to be firmly established. Its chief had spent a long life in constant struggle and constant success. He had able ministers, a strong parliamentary majority, an increasing revenue of above sixty millions sterling, and a well disciplined army of nearly 400,000 men, of whom 40,000 occupied Paris and the chain of fortresses (impregnable except by long siege) which surround the city. Nearly fifty years had passed since France gave up in disgust her republican experiment, and she was enjoying, under the mild rule of a descendant from her ancient monarchs, an amount of prosperity such as she had never before possessed or could reasonably have expected. Yet, in the midst of this apparent calm, M. de Tocqueville saw the coming storm. ‘*Est-ce que vous ne ressentez pas,*’ said he, on the 27th of January, 1848, ‘*que le sol tremble de nouveau en Europe? Est-ce que vous ne sentez pas — que dirai-je? un vent de révolutions qui est dans l’air? Est-ce que vous avez, à l’heure où nous sommes, la certitude d’un lendemain? Est-ce que vous savez ce qui peut arriver en France d’ici à un an, à un mois, à un jour peut-être? Vous l’ignorez; mais ce que*

‘vous savez, c’est que la tempête est à l’horizon, c’est qu’elle marche sur vous.’

Certainly the events which followed each of these revolutions could not have been predicted with equal confidence. It might, however, have been foreseen in 1789 that so vain, ambitious, and unscrupulous a people as the French, when released for the first time in their history from the restraints of regular government, would either provoke an attack from their neighbours, or, as was in fact their conduct towards England, would become the aggressors; that they would be defeated at sea, but would overthrow the selfish, unpopular, and unskilful sovereigns of the Continent; and that a few years of war, whether successful or unsuccessful, must drive them to a military dictatorship. It might again have been foreseen, on the 25th of February, 1848, that the fall of royalty in France would shake every throne in Germany and Italy. That constitutions, based on representative assemblies, would be everywhere required, everywhere granted, and everywhere misused. That the Austrian empire, which has so long been undergoing a process of dissolution under the solvent of the Metternich policy, would lose, at least for a time, its cohesion; that the complicated, cumbersome, and inartificial fabric of the German confederation would fall to pieces; that Rome would no longer submit to be administered by priests; and that Sicily would demand the constitution of which she had been defrauded. All these events might have been predicted on sure data. At the same time, it must be admitted, that many of those which followed were not to be foreseen. No one could have expected the people of Schleswig and Holstein to rebel against a good and improving government, and incur the miseries of civil war and revolution, on a question of succession, which does not call for a present decision, and indeed never may require one. No one could have expected the whole of Germany to sympathise with this wicked folly, and attack an inoffensive and friendly power in order to detach from it two of its most valuable provinces. No one could have expected that a period of weakness and danger, with revolution in her capital, and civil and foreign war in her richest territories, would have been selected by Austria as a fit occasion to annul the ancient constitution of Hungary. No one could have supposed that when this attempt seemed likely to fail, she would have called in the aid of her most formidable enemy, and thrown herself at the feet of Russia. No one could have expected the Romans to drive out the most popular and the most liberal of their popes, or the French Republic to restore an ecclesiastical monarchy. The first invasion of Lom-



bardly by Piedmont surprised no one, but who could have foretold the second? Who could have expected a people and king who, not seven months before, had been saved from destruction only by the magnanimity of their conqueror, to renew the attack whilst their forces were weakened and dispirited, and his were increased in numbers and encouraged by victory? \*

The great difficulty in predicting the future state of nations arises not so much from their policy depending on volition as from the want of principles from which their volition, in a given case, can be anticipated. In proportion to the virtue and intelligence of a man we can calculate his future conduct under given circumstances. We know that so far as he is good and

---

\* One of the remarkable predictions of distant events is contained in a letter from the Abbé Galiani to Madame d'Épinay, written in 1771. He thus foretells the state of Europe in the nineteenth century:—*'Le résultat est que nous ressemblerons beaucoup plus aux Chinois que nous ne leur ressemblerons à présent. Il y aura deux religions très-marquées, celle des grands et des lettrés et celle du peuple. Il y aura beaucoup de troupes sur pied et presque point de guerre. Le grand souverain de l'Europe sera celui qui possédera la Pologne et la Russie, et qui commandera à la Baltique, et à la Mer Noire. Le reste des princes sera maîtrisé par la politique de ce cabinet prédominant. Il y aura despotisme partout; mais despotisme sans cruauté; sans goutte de sang répandue. Un despotisme de chicane, et fondé toujours sur l'interprétation des vieilles lois, sur la ruse et l'astuce du palais et de la robe. Dans ce temps à les sciences à la mode seront les physiques. Plus de théologie, plus d'antiquités, plus de langues savantes. Pour la jurisprudence, toutes les nations de l'Europe auront un code particulier et les lois romaines seront anéanties. On tirera la chicane des sources les plus magnifiques, telles que l'esprit de la constitution de chaque nation et l'ordre essentiel. Les sottes lois favorables à l'exportation et contraires à l'importation détruiront tout commerce; car, lorsque tout le monde veut donner et personne ne veut recevoir, il en arrive que personne ne donne ni ne reçoit plus rien.'*<sup>1</sup>

The events of 1848 have impaired the resemblance, but this was not a bad portrait of the Continent in its immediately previous state. The difference in religious opinions between the educated and uneducated classes, the large armies employed in doing nothing, the mild despotism directed by lawyers, the substitution of local codes for the Roman law, the preference of physical to theological or classical studies, the sacrifice of commerce to protection, and the political preponderance of Russia, could scarcely have been described in truer language, if the author had been writing from Vienna in 1847.

---

<sup>1</sup> *'Correspondance inédite de l'Abbé Galiani,'* tome premier, pp. 223—225.

wise he will be governed, first, by his duty, and next by his interest. If he be intelligent, but immoral, he will pursue only his interest. If he be stupid, but moral, he will endeavour to do what he thinks right, though he may mistake the means or even the object. But if he be neither moral nor intelligent—if he have neither virtue enough to select what is right, nor sense enough to know what is profitable, what is to be expected but that he will be governed by the passion or the caprice of the moment? and who can tell what that will be?

Now this is the case of a nation. Any individual who should be guilty of one half of the follies which have been committed by either France, Prussia, Schleswig, Holstein, Baden, Austria, Lombardy, Venice, Rome, Tuscany, or Naples, during the last two years, would be placed by his friends under restraint, as incapable of managing his own affairs. Any individual who should be guilty of one half of the crimes of which every one of these highly-civilised nations has been guilty during the last two years, would be hunted out of society. What would Charles Albert, or what would any of Charles Albert's counsellors have said, if he had been advised to behave to a private individual as Piedmont behaved to Austria? How would Odillon Barrot and Falloux have received a proposal to enter forcibly on the estate of a friend, in order to preserve their legitimate influence with him; and, if he refused to admit them, to break open his house and murder his servants? The *wickedness* of nations may probably be explained by the weakness of a diffused responsibility, by the absence of a superior, capable of punishing wrong doers, by the frequent success of violence and fraud, and by the consequent absence of any well-regulated public opinion. They are examples of what individuals would be in that unnatural state which has been called the state of nature, without law and without justice. The *folly* of nations principally arises from their comparative inability to profit by experience. The experience of a man is personal,—that of a nation historical. A man retains his identity. He is the same person at sixty as he was at twenty. He recollects what was his early conduct, and what were its fruits. The identity of a nation is perpetually changing. Every thirty years the conduct of its affairs is in the hands of a new generation, who know only from tradition the fortunes of their predecessors. How many are now the statesmen of France who took part in its affairs under the empire? How many of those who are now active in its public business, will in twenty years be removed by death, or illness, or indifference, or exile? How many will have succeeded to them, who now think of nothing but their education, or their profession, or their plea-

tures? To learn from the experience of others, is the privilege of a rare degree of intelligence. But this is what a nation must do, if it is to learn from any long experience: for its own is that of only a few years.

The sixth chapter treats of the number of persons competent to guide opinion on any subject, as compared with the number of the rest of the community. That number Mr. Lewis finds to be very small; consisting, in fact, of the most distinguished members of the small minority who have made the different subjects of speculation and practice matters of especial study. But though he sets little value on public opinion as a guide to truth, he attaches great importance to it as a guide to conduct. The statesman must humour the feelings, the prejudices, and even the follies of the people. To what extent he must do this, depends not so much on any general principles of human nature, as on national and temporary peculiarities. In Southern India, among a people who have borne taxation up to confiscation without a murmur, the alteration of a turban produced an insurrection. The English of the sixteenth century allowed Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, to change the national religion from Catholic to semi-Catholic, from semi-Catholic to Protestant, from Protestant to Catholic, and from Catholic to Protestant. The English of the seventeenth century passed the Test Act, and would not permit even toleration.

‘There are other subjects,’ adds Mr. Lewis, ‘in which the taste of the great body of the people establishes a standard, for the guidance of those whose business it is to supply the public with amusement, or by speech or writing to reach their feelings or convictions.’

In public speaking, acting, painting,—in short, in every art which is addressed to the public at large,—popular favour is the criterion of success. The poet, the musician, the architect, the sculptor, is most successful whose work is most admired. Is he then the most excellent?—‘No,’ says Mr. Lewis: ‘true excellence in each art is to be decided by the judgment of persons of exercised taste and observation in that art, not by the opinion of the multitude.’\* But if the persons of exercised taste and observation differ in opinion from the public, where are the premises, by means of which the question is to be decided? If works of art, which are produced for the simple purpose of giving pleasure, actually give that pleasure,—how can it be proved that they ought not to do so? It appears

to us that this is a question which can be solved only by posterity.

*'Est vetus atque bonus centum qui vixerit annos.'*

A future age may reverse the decision of the many, or of the few; or even that of the many and few combined. The euphuists of Queen Elizabeth's days were as universally admired as they would now be derided. Sometimes, though rarely, the taste of successive generations oscillates. For about six centuries Gothic architecture was the object of universal and almost exclusive veneration. Its works covered Italy, Spain, France, Germany, and Great Britain. Then followed two centuries, during which it was despised; and some of its finest specimens were supposed to be improved by Grecian additions. Now public favour has returned to it. A somewhat similar fate has befallen the Flemish painters, Hans Hemmling, Van Eyck, and the other masters of that formal, highly-finished, and yet simple school.

There is one art, however, of which, as Mr. Lewis has remarked, the ultimate test is immediate success, — and that is oratory, to which may be added acting. All other artists look for the admiration of future ages. They strive to produce something which the world will not willingly let die. The actor can look only to the present. He may, indeed, hope to live for a few years in the memory of those whom he has charmed; but when they are gone, all that remains of powers, which the greatest poets and the greatest orators might have envied, is a name, which tells us no more than the inscriptions on the monuments of Nineveh. What do we really know of Roscius, or Henderson, or Le Kain, or Clairon? To how many is Siddons more than a name, or even the star that has just set, Catalani? If Jenny Lind should execute her cruel purpose of leaving the stage, what will survive fifty years hence of the meteor which passed over Sweden, Germany, and England, but the recollections of a few septuagenarians, and a tradition that the name of Lind once expressed the perfection of acting and of song? The orator, indeed, may be reported, or may re-write his speeches, and in that form may delight posterity. But what is a written speech? We know that the author of the best written speeches which we possess, probably of the best that ever were written, held that the real merit of an orator consisted, not in his literary, but in his histrionic powers; not in his composition, but in his delivery. We know that his written eloquence, when reproduced by his illustrious rival, with all the histrionic advantages which that great speaker could give to it, was, by the confession of Eschines himself, merely a faint imitation. When we read a speech we

apply it to purposes for which it was not intended. We seek in it instruction and amusement. The orator, if he was a real orator, did not intend to instruct or to amuse. His purpose was to persuade. Wit, imagination, philosophy, every merit of style and composition which did not contribute to this object, he rejected. If repetition, exaggeration, over-strained passion, or any other kind of false taste, was useful, he admitted it. O'Connell knew as well as we do that he talked nonsense about hereditary bondsmen and the finest peasantry in Europe; but while pouring out that nonsense he was one of the greatest, because he was one of the most effective orators, that ever spoke. All that has come to us of Sheridan's celebrated speech on Hasting's trial appears, when we read it in cold blood, tawdry trash; but we know that it was a great speech, not from the praises that were bestowed on it, but from the effect that it produced.

The seventh and eighth chapters may be considered together. They treat of the application of the principle of authority to political bodies:—

'There is,' says Mr. Lewis, 'one subject in which it is necessary that opinions should be counted, and not weighed; that the greater number should prevail over the less, without reference to the intrinsic value of their opinions, and should decide the practical course of action. This subject is civil government, so far as it depends on the decisions of political bodies. In the following remarks, I propose to examine the causes of this necessity, and the extent to which its consequences are moderated and counteracted in practice by a voluntary deference to the contrary principle.'

'In the earliest governments which history presents to us, viz., those of the great empires of Western Asia, everything, from the monarch down to the lowest civil functionary, was organised on the principle of individual action. Being all absolute or despotic monarchies, the principle of a political body was indeed necessarily excluded from the form of their supreme government; the sovereignty always resided in a single person, and not in any council of nobles or popular assembly. No trace of corporate action, no vestige of the existence of any board, or jury-court, or collegium, can be discovered even in any subordinate part of the political system of the purely Oriental States; nor have they, at the present day, advanced beyond this very simple and primitive organisation.'

'Oriental civilisation has never yet reached the stage which is compatible with discussion concerning common interests, by a body of councillors possessing equal rights, each of them entitled to give advice to the rest, and to express an independent opinion. The qualities essential to oral discussion in a numerous assembly are, toleration of contradiction and censure; with such a power of self-command and suspension of the judgment, as enables a person to

listen to, and understand, arguments hostile to his own views; to treat them with deference, and to give them a suitable answer. If these qualities do not prevail throughout the assembly, the assertion of adverse opinions, and their comparison and examination, are rendered impossible; the speaker is interrupted by clamour, vociferation, denials, insults, and threats; the entire assembly becomes a scene of turbulence and confusion, and intelligible debate is at an end.\*

It is remarkable how well the last sentence describes an animated debate in the late Constituent Assembly of France. In that assembly a speech on any exciting matter was not a continuous discourse. It was a series of short sentences, or attempts at sentences, each of which was interrupted by an explosion of fierce denial or ferocious abuse from one side or from the other. Then followed the reprimands, the complaints, and at last the entreaties of the president, exhorting, threatening, and beseeching for order and silence. Then came, perhaps, a few moments of calm, the screamers being exhausted, and the speaker got out another sentence, which provoked a repetition of the storm. The debate was a sort of trilogy, to which the interrupters contributed the greatest part, the president the next, and the speaker by far the least. The present Assembly is a little more orderly, partly because it was originally rather smaller in number, and partly because the Thirteenth of June has removed its most vociferous members; but, a stranger does not easily believe that it exhibits the collective wisdom, and still less the collective good breeding of France.

Mr. Lewis discovers the first traces of political bodies among the Greeks, from whom they were imitated by the Carthaginians and the Romans. Some centuries later they are found among the Gauls and Germans, either as a native institution or imported from Italy. On the fall of the Roman Empire the Goths and Germans introduced them into every part of Europe; and though their power was weakened by the despotisms which existed in the greater part of Continental Europe during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, they have recovered their power in the nineteenth, and are now the principal instruments by which civilised nations are governed.

The instant that they were established it became necessary to ascertain by what means their opinion should be ascertained. There are, of course, only three expedients, — to require unanimity, or to let the decision depend on the vote of the majority, or of the minority.

Unanimity is usually required at congresses constituted of the delegates from sovereigns. Nations generally, and with great reason, distrust one another too much to consent to be bound by any voice except their own. The consequence is, that congresses seldom produce a result, except where the parties were previously agreed in principle, and meet merely to settle the details. The Congress of Vienna broke up without any decision, and probably would not have been reassembled unless Bonaparte's return from Elba had frightened its members into sudden unanimity. The Congress of Verona met merely to arrange the means by which a common purpose was to be effected. In the Congress of 1840 France objected to every thing, and the four other Powers were forced to settle the Eastern questions without her. The Congress which was proposed to be held in Brussels in 1848 on the affairs of Italy was never complete, and the ministers who attended it separated without a protocol. Mr. Lewis remarks, that the unanimity required from English jurors gives rise to many inconveniences, — such as unmeaning compromises, tossing up for verdicts, and forcing concurrence by starvation, — but has been found consistent with a regular, if not a very intelligent administration of justice. Perhaps its most useful result is the necessity which it imposes on the judge of making his charge so clear that not a single jurymen shall remain unconvinced. If a mere majority could give him the verdict which he thinks just, he probably would take less pains to demonstrate its propriety than when he can be defeated by the opposition of one individual.

In some political bodies an unreal appearance of unanimity is obtained by an agreement between the members to carry into effect the decision of the majority, and to conceal their own differences. This is the usual conduct of cabinets in representative governments. Sometimes one or two questions are left open, as too important for compromise. On these the members of the cabinet are at open variance. On all others they profess to agree. It seems at first sight monstrous that men should vote and even speak in favour of measures which they believe to be mischievous; but it is unavoidable. If all questions were open, and the minority of the cabinet opposed or merely refused to support the majority, few important measures could be carried. All such measures, whatever be their merits, have also their disadvantages. They offer sometimes only a choice of dangers, sometimes only a choice of evils. And yet action, perhaps immediate action, may be necessary. If members of the cabinet which proposes such action were known to be opposed to it, they would often be followed by a majority of the House.

On the other hand this practice weakens the authority of a cabinet minister in debate. The House is never certain that he does not utterly disapprove the resolution which he is urging it to adopt.

'It seems scarcely necessary to prove,' continues Mr. Lewis, 'that if the decision is not to be unanimous, it must be made by a majority; the hypothesis of the minority of a political body prevailing, by their votes, over the majority, leads to all sorts of practical absurdities.' \*

There are, however, some circumstances under which this must occur, unless the decision depends upon a bare majority. There are many cases in which the question is not in what direction we shall advance, but whether we shall advance or remain stationary; whether we shall act or be quiescent. In such cases, if unanimity, or anything more than a bare majority be required for a decision, and the minority be in favour of quiescence, the minority in fact prevails over the majority. It has the power of stopping every proceeding of the aggregate body; and, if it consent to allow it to act, may impose such terms as it thinks fit. This was the secret of Lord Eldon's influence over the cabinets of which he was a member. He was generally opposed to action, always to improvement, and his hostility to any reform was to be mitigated only by exceptions, omissions, and qualifications, which destroyed three fourths of its efficiency. He was the tribune of the narrow-minded oligarchy, and never was intercession more profusely interposed. One or two bigoted cantons exercised a similar power under the old Swiss Pacte. They conceded only on their own conditions the few acts which they allowed the Diet to pass.

'Decision by a majority,' continues Mr. Lewis, 'places all the members of the body upon the same footing, and gives an equal value to the opinion of each. It makes no distinction between them as to competency, but allows the same weight to the vote of the persons most able, and of those least able, to form a correct judgment upon the question to be decided. It therefore proceeds upon a principle directly opposed to the principle adopted voluntarily by those who are not restrained by legal rules,—in guiding their practical conduct by the opinions of others, *they* look not to numbers, but to special fitness.

'The necessity, however, of having recourse to this principle arises from the nature of political government, and the expediency of a coercive supreme power, which it implies. Whenever the ultimate decision is vested in a body, there is, by the supposition, no ulterior authority which can, in case of difference of opinion, determine who are competent judges, and who are not. There is, therefore, no



other alternative than to count the numbers, and to abide by the opinion of the majority. The contrivance may be rude, but it is the least bad which can be devised.

‘A decision by the majority of a political body is, in some respects, analogous to a battle between the armies of two independent nations. It settles a question which must be settled, and which cannot be settled in any other manner. The one is an appeal to physical force, the other is an appeal to moral force; it is the right of the stronger reduced to a legal expression.’\*

Mr. Lewis proceeds to consider the means by which this inherent defect in political bodies — the preference of numbers to integrity, talents, and knowledge — may be palliated.

An obvious and common expedient is to give to persons having some quality, which is supposed to be a mark of peculiar fitness, additional votes. The quality generally selected for this purpose is the possession of property. It is the least invidious, since every one may hope to acquire it, — it is the most easily ascertained, and when owing to inheritance, generally implies superior education, — when created, talent, or at least good conduct. In the confederacies of independent States, where the decision of the majority binds, political power is substituted for property. Thus, under the Germanic confederation, the six most important States had each four votes, the five next three votes each, the three next two votes each, and the twenty-four others had a vote a-piece.

Another expedient is the voting by, what Mr. Lewis calls, composite units. Thus in Rome, for certain purposes, the people voted by centuries, and the majority of centuries prevailed. But power was given to the rich by constituting from them several small centuries, and taken from the poor by throwing them into a few large ones. Under most European constitutions the supreme power resides in what we may, for the present purpose, call three estates, the king or other chief ruler alone forming one. The Queen of England has, theoretically, as much legislative power as the House of Lords or the House of Commons.

Far more effectual than any of these expedients, or indeed than all of them combined, is representation — next to the creation of political bodies the greatest step that has ever been made in the art of government. The experience of many thousand years has shown that the action of the democratic element is necessary to the existence of even the very defective amount of good government which any portion of the

world has as yet enjoyed. Pure monarchies, and pure aristocracies, and the mixture of the two, have always sacrificed the interests of the many, where they appeared opposed to those of the one or of the few, and have generally misunderstood them when they wished really to promote them. But until representation was invented, it was impossible to apply democracy either to a large country or to a large population. The inhabitants of the island of Elba are perhaps not too numerous to manage their own affairs directly; but small as the island appears, probably not one tenth of the people would be able to attend habitually any place of public council. No part of Paris is distant an hour's walk from the centre, but the number of its inhabitants is too large for direct political action. The result of the attempt in 1848 was the extemporisation of a republic by a few thousand ruffians, to the astonishment of the mass of the people and to the shame and consternation of the educated classes. Representation has solved this difficulty. By its aid the largest territory and the densest population may be governed democratically as effectually as a village. This was probably the only purpose for which representation was originally introduced. A further incidental advantage is, that the representative is generally superior in education to the mass of his electors. There is a tendency, indeed, in popular constituencies, to select persons belonging to the highest aristocracy, partly because they are more generally known, and partly because the pretensions of a superior excite less jealousy than those of an equal. Many contrivances have been adopted for the purpose of increasing the chances of a good selection. Neither voting by composite units, nor the giving to an individual additional votes proportioned to his property (familiar as they are in the choice of officers), have been applied to the choice of representatives; but in most representative governments the possession of a certain amount of a certain kind of property has been required as a qualification for the elector and also for the elected. Women and children, and unnaturalised foreigners, are universally excluded. So are generally persons receiving public assistance, persons in the immediate employ of the government, and sometimes persons not professing the religion of the state. These and similar exclusions constitute the genus of representative governments, to which the name of *exclusive* may be given.

Mr. Lewis has not, we think, paid sufficient attention to this genus. He appears to treat an exclusive government as an aristocracy; but it seems to us clear that a government may be at the same time very exclusive and yet very democratic. Athens, under Pericles, was a democracy, though nine tenths of the

Athenians were excluded from the government. France, under Louis Philippe, was more democratic than England, though the French voters were not one in a hundred, and the English voters were about one in twelve.

Another plan is indirect election. This is merely carrying the elective principle one stage further. As the qualities which fit a man to be an elector are less rare, and are more easily ascertained than those which fit him to be a legislator, it is more likely that the people at large will select good electors than good representatives. It has the further advantage, that it is the least dangerous mode in which the principle of exclusion can be altogether got rid of, or, in other words, universal suffrage be granted. And this is no slight advantage. Exclusive governments are forced to adopt arbitrary lines of demarcation. There is no substantial reason for giving a vote to a householder and not to a fundholder; or to the occupier of a house worth 10*l.* and not to the occupier of one worth only 9*l.* 1*s.* The excluded, and therefore dissatisfied majority, are always a cause of weakness. To these correctives of the pure numerical principle must be added the influence of leaders among the electors, and that of political connexions, and of heads of parties, in the representative body.

‘It follows,’ concludes Mr. Lewis, ‘from what has been said in this and the preceding chapter, that popular government, as now understood and carried into effect, for large territories, by means of the representative system, is to a great extent founded, legally and theoretically, upon the numerical principle; but that morally and in practice, the working of this principle is modified, counteracted, and crossed in various directions, by the influence of the antagonist principle of special fitness. In arranging the terms of this compromise, and in adapting them to a given community, lies the secret of a free constitution.’

‘A compromise of this kind (as we have already had occasion to remark in reference to the subject of decision by a majority), necessarily implies a junction and an amalgamation of opposite principles. It supposes that sufficient weight will be given to the numerical principle, for interesting the bulk of the community in the existing order of things, and attaching them to the government; while such an admixture of the principle of special fitness will be secured, as will prevent the government from falling into the hands of persons who, from their ignorance, inexperience, or want of judgment, are incapable of properly directing its course.’\*

On one of the most important questions connected with representation, we are sorry not to have Mr. Lewis's opinion.

It is this. The number of representatives and of constituents being given, what are the advantages and inconveniences of comparatively large and small constituencies, and consequently of numerous, or few, or even individual representatives? There being, for instance, within a given district, 400,000 constituents, who are to return twenty representatives, what would be the effect of throwing them into one, or perhaps two constituencies, each man voting in the former case for twenty, and in the latter case for ten, representatives, as compared with the effects of dividing them into twenty constituencies, each returning a single member, or into ten, each returning two members?

The latter is the English system. The city of London is the only constituency which returns more than two members, and several return only one. The other is the modern French system. Each of the eighty-four departments returns a portion of the seven hundred and fifty representatives, proportioned to its population—the smallest number being three, and the largest twenty-eight.

The most obvious tendency of the French, or collective, or, as it is called in America, the ticket, system, is towards the disfranchisement of all but the members of a single party. If France were one constituency for the election of representatives, as it is for the election of a president, and each elector had to vote for 750 representatives, it is probable that a single list would prevail, almost without alteration. We will suppose the country divided into Legitimists, Orleanists, Bonapartists, and Republicans, in the following proportions: four thirteenths Republicans, and three thirteenths belonging to each of the other denominations. Under such circumstances the Republican party, though scarcely exceeding one fourth of the whole population, would return nearly the whole Assembly. If there were only two parties, about equally balanced in numbers, mere accident would decide which should be not merely omnipotent, but unopposed, and which should be not only excluded from power, but unrepresented. If such be the effect of the collective system when fully carried out, such must be its tendency when partially adopted. And it must be admitted to be most mischievous both to the successful and to the unsuccessful party; impelling one to acts of insolent oppression, and driving the other towards disaffection and revolution. The other extreme—that of subdividing the voters, so as to give a separate constituency to each representative,—has a tendency, though in a much slighter degree, to produce a similar effect. In each constituency one party only is represented, though the frequent agglomeration of persons of the same political opinions in particular districts, would

probably ensure, if the districts were small, a representation of the minority. The plan, however, which effects this most effectually, often, indeed, to excess, is that which, with the single exception of the city of London, was adopted by our ancestors: the giving two members to each constituency. The natural result is a compromise — the return of one member by each party. If there were two constituencies of 1025 voters each, 525 in each being Tories, and 500 Whigs, and each returning a single member, it follows that two Tories would be returned. If they were thrown together, and had to return two members, it is probable that the result would be, one Tory and one Whig. The 1050 Tories would not attempt to carry two members against the 1000 Whigs. Perhaps the arrangement which best reconciles the two important purposes of giving preponderance to the will of the majority, and of securing a fair hearing to the minority, is, to give to each constituent body three members. The majority must always return two. The minority, unless it were very weak or very negligent, could seldom be prevented from carrying one.

On the other hand, the collective system is comparatively favourable both to the selection of fit representatives, and to their good conduct when selected. A small constituency is open to bribery, and is exposed to intimidation; where these are not used, its favour is gained by treating, by canvassing, by flattering its prejudices and perhaps its evil passions, its national animosities, its envy or its intolerance, or by pledges which it may be infamous to break and wicked to keep. Its favour is retained by local expenditure, by jobbing, by sacrificing to its petty jealousies and temporary convenience, or to its commercial, or manufacturing, or agricultural monopolies the large and permanent interests of the community; by yielding to its narrow-minded fancies and gratifying its ignorant antipathies. From these evil influences a collective constituency is free. No one can purchase or frighten, or even canvass a whole department. The leading men of each party make out their lists. They decide for their respective followers, who among the candidates of their own opinion shall be supported. They do not select provincial magnates or local demagogues, the stars of a country town, but men of metropolitan reputation. The representative is independent of his constituents. He has not purchased them by promises, and need not sell them for places. While the great public of the people approve his conduct, he may despise local unpopularity. If he become a distinguished member of the Assembly, he is sure at the next election to be put upon twenty different lists: he can afford, therefore, to act

honestly, without being degraded by the fear which always disturbs the imagination and distorts the policy of an English statesman,—the fear of losing his seat.

We cannot quit this portion of the work, without considering a subject slightly alluded to by Mr. Lewis in the seventh chapter—the propriety of admitting into legislation and administration a system of compromise and fiction;—a system, according to which, sometimes a principle acknowledged, and partially acted on, is not fully carried out; sometimes two inconsistent principles are each avowed, and each from time to time obeyed; and sometimes a theoretic rule of conduct is laid down, and in practice is violated systematically. The extent to which this system prevails in England is almost ludicrous.

Thus, in theory, the English sovereign is a substantial power. He selects and dismisses his ministers, his pleasure is taken on all appointments, he gives or refuses validity to all legislation. In practice the Crown is a phantom, accepting the ministers tendered to it by the Commons, retaining them while they retain the confidence of that House, placing at their disposal all its patronage, and assenting to every bill which the two Houses have agreed on. According to the theory of the English law, marriage is indissoluble. In practice, in case of the wife's adultery, it is dissolved by a private law. In theory, the intermarriage of the adulteress and her paramour is forbidden. There is a standing order of the House of Lords that no divorce bill be read, which does not contain a clause to that effect. In practice such intermarriages are constant. A motion is always made, and always assented to by the House, that, for this one time, the standing order be suspended. The English consider, and with reason, the publication of the debates in the House of Commons one of their most important usages. There are few single causes to which so much good, and, we must add, so much evil, is to be attributed. But this practice, which influences sometimes mischievously and sometimes beneficially the whole course of our government, is not merely unprotected by law,—it is positively illegal. It is a contempt of the House of Commons; and, from time to time, some Irish member summons to the bar the printer and publisher of a newspaper, and threatens them with imprisonment, ostensibly for reporting, really for not reporting the complainant in the dimensions which his senatorial rank requires. Even the presence of auditors is a violation of the standing orders of the House. The debates which, in hundreds of thousands of reports, fly through the whole civilised world are, in theory, secret. Nor is the standing order, like some others, invoked only to be dispensed

with. It is enforced not on the motion, but merely at the suggestion of a single member, without an appeal, without even a discussion.

The whole jurisdiction of our Courts of Equity is one gigantic compromise. The English common law judges, — perhaps the least intelligent makers, and the most perverse interpreters of law, that the world has ever seen,—laid down and adhered to certain rules respecting property and contracts, against which common sense revolted. The clerical Chancellors resolved to get rid of them. They could not control the common law courts. But they forbade all persons to have recourse to them for these purposes. ‘The law,’ said the ‘Chancellor, ‘which gives to the mortgagee the mortgaged property, if the mortgagor does not repay the principal on the appointed day, is unjust. We cannot prevent the courts of law from adhering to their rule, but woe be to the suitor who accepts their assistance. He is guilty of a contempt of the Court of Chancery, and shall be imprisoned until he makes restitution.’ So, again, if a man, forced to take part in a civil war, entrusted his property to a friend, in less danger of forfeiture or confiscation than himself, the courts of law said, the property has been given to the trustee, it is his, and he shall keep it. The Court of Chancery said, it is not his, he shall not keep it, and though we have not the means of taking bodily possession of it, and handing it over to the true owner, we will imprison the trustee until he gives it up. One of the strangest parts of this strange system is that the courts of law acquiesce in it. They acknowledge the monstrous injustice of their own rules, but say that they do no harm, since the Courts of Equity supply a remedy. And thus a state of things has grown up, unintelligible to any but the lawyers of England, and of the nations that have borrowed their institutions from England, under which nearly all the property of the country has two different owners, often two different sets of owners; one having a clear indisputable title at law, and therefore called the legal owner, the other having a clear indisputable title in equity, and therefore called the equitable owner.

But though this spirit of compromise and fiction is carried by us to excess, we admit, with Mr. Lewis, that within limits, (which, however, are not capable of being predefined,) it is valuable, —that it may often be useful ‘to establish a principle on account of certain effects which it produces, and as far as regards these effects, to allow an unimpeded course to their action; but, with respect to other effects, which would, if permitted to arise without restraint be productive of mischief, to

‘try to neutralise and impede them by adverse and repressing influences.’\*

The ninth chapter, on the propagation of sound opinions by the creation of a trustworthy authority, is one of the most important in the work: but we are so near our limits, that we can consider only a small portion of it,—that which inquires whether it is the duty of a Government to diffuse and encourage religious truth, and to repress and discourage religious error. Mr. Lewis begins by laying down, in bold and unqualified terms, that the only criterion for trying the duty of the State to interfere in any matter, is the expediency of the interference.

‘If the interference,’ he says, ‘is likely to be attended with advantage to the community, if the end to which it is directed be good, and it be likely to promote that end, then the duty of the State is to interfere.

‘The question as to the duty of the State with respect to the encouragement of truth, and the discouragement of error, must be decided on these grounds. Everybody admits that (provided his own standard of judgment be adopted) it is right and fitting to encourage truth and discourage error. About the desirableness of the end there is an universal agreement: that the promotion of this end lies, theoretically and legally, within the province of the State, and that a government possesses powers which can be directed towards this object, are certain. It follows that, if the attempt is likely to be attended with success, and to be, on the whole, advantageous to the community, it ought to be made; but that if the attempt is likely to fail, and the cause of truth is not likely to be promoted by it, the State ought not to interfere.’†

There is no doubt that religious error is one of the causes which have most interrupted the advance of civilisation. It seems to arrest a nation at some point of its progress, and to prevent, or at least materially to retard, its further improvement. Even one of the least oppressive of superstitions,—that of the Greeks and Romans,—though it permitted great intellectual development, so perverted the moral feelings of the two races, that, in both the one and the other, the period of splendour was soon followed by one of irrecoverable decline, until each fell before invaders inferior in knowledge and refinement, but superior in the virtues which enable countries to retain their independence. The nations which have professed Buddhism, Hindooism, Mahometanism, and the creeds which govern China and Japan, have all, sooner or later, reached a point at which they have been stationary for ages. The only religion which admits of unlimited improvement is Christianity, and the forms of it which we believe

---

\* P. 236.

† P. 288.



to be least infected by error, are the most favourable to the diffusion of real civilisation. The only great Roman Catholic population in Europe which can be compared to the Protestant populations is that of France; and it is to be observed that the really Roman Catholic portion of the French, the peasantry, are far less civilised than the Protestant peasantry of Germany, Holland, and England. The dirt, untidyness, and general discomfort of a French village are intolerable to any one who enters France from a Protestant country.

Such being the mischievous tendencies of religious error, is it in the power of the State to prevent its introduction, or to extirpate it when introduced?

Mr. Lewis thinks that it is.

‘That the system,’ he says, ‘of enforcing religious truth by punishment—the system which its enemies call religious persecution—has been to a great extent successful, cannot be disputed. It is impossible to doubt that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the protestant or reformed faith was greatly checked by the temporal power of the Catholic governments. It was checked in two ways,—by preventing its entrance into a country (as in Italy and Spain), and by expelling it from countries in which it had taken root (as in Southern Germany, France, and Flanders). The transportation of the Moriscos from Spain, the expulsion of the Jews from several countries, and the destruction of the Christians in Japan, afford other examples of the success of forcible measures for the extirpation of a creed which the government deemed erroneous.’\*

He decides, however, for the following reasons, against the expediency of persecution. First, because religious error cannot be suppressed by severity, since what one nation regards as error another regards as truth. Secondly, because even those who do not share the opinions of a martyr, respect his sincerity; because ‘there is a sympathy with his sufferings and a consciousness that the State, instead of gaining his conviction by the legitimate weapons of persuasion and reason, has, being the stronger, used its strength for causing its own opinion to prevail.’

‘Hence,’ he adds, ‘the use of force to diffuse religious opinions, by admitting the failures of reason in the individual case, has seemed to raise a presumption that reason was on the weaker side. True opinions in religion can, in the long run, only be propagated by reason, and that voluntary deference to authority which implies reason; but false opinions in religion can be as well propagated by force as true ones. The sword, the stake, or the gibbet, are as good arguments in behalf of Mahometanism as of Christianity. In this way, the use of the civil power to repress religious error, has been

accounted almost as an admission that the other side were in the right; martyrdom has been regarded as a sign of truth, as well as of sincerity; and the infant church has been said to have been watered by the blood of its martyrs. Both the reason and feelings of mankind are outraged, by applying to the diffusion of truth means which are used reluctantly and sparingly even for the punishment of overt acts against society.\*

We confess that this reasoning does not appear to us conclusive. It is true that no common effort will ever be made by the European Governments to put down or set up any one form of Christianity, and consequently that religious error cannot be driven out of Europe. But if it be admitted that it is in the power of persecution to introduce and to extirpate peculiar doctrines in a given country, the impossibility of doing this universally is not an argument against doing it partially. If precautions against cholera are found to be effectual, the refusal of our neighbours to take them is no reason for refusing to take them ourselves. Nor is the sympathy of the public for religious offenders a ground for leaving them unpunished. The public often sympathises with political offenders,—yet we punish rebels and traitors. Nine tenths of the people of Ireland sympathise with Smith O'Brien and Meagher,—but we do not recall them from transportation. Nor is it true that ‘only true opinions in religion can in the long run be propagated by reason, and by that voluntary deference to authority which implies reason.’ Archbishop Whately has shown that most of what we call the errors of Romanism, are opinions natural to the human mind; and we know that many of them grew up and established themselves by means of reason, or of what was called reason, and of authority, long before the State interfered to propagate or to protect them. The fact seems to be that religious truth, and religious error, can both be propagated by argument and authority, and can both be suppressed by persecution and force.

If, then, religious truth be favourable, and religious error unfavourable to the welfare of a people,—if it be in the power of the State, by means of persecution, to diffuse the former, and to extirpate, or at least to discourage the latter,—and if it be the duty of the State to do all that it can do to promote the welfare of its subjects, on what grounds ought it to abstain from persecution?

The able author of the ‘Letters on the Church’ admits, that he can find no arguments against persecution which ought to convince a Mahometan or a Pagan ruler. ‘But,’ he adds,

‘ those who profess the Christian religion, and seek to supp of  
 ‘ their faith by the secular arm, I would rebuke in the words  
 ‘ their Master, saying, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye  
 ‘ “are of;” I would urge that Christ himself has expressly re-  
 ‘ nounced all secular authority, and *forbidden* all coercion in the  
 ‘ cause of his religion, both by his declaration that his “king-  
 ‘ “dom is not of this world,” (which would manifestly be false,  
 ‘ if he authorised the employment of force in his cause,) and by  
 ‘ the whole tenour of the religion he founded, by every thing  
 ‘ said or done by himself and his apostles, that could in the  
 ‘ most decided manner confirm and illustrate that declaration.  
 ‘ And I would point out that the passages of the Old Testa-  
 ‘ ment, which have been erroneously adduced in opposition to  
 ‘ this doctrine, afford, in truth, a strong confirmation of it, by  
 ‘ the relation they manifestly bear to a totally different system;  
 ‘ to a kingdom which *was* of this world, having Jehovah for its  
 ‘ supreme Magistrate, administering his government by temporal  
 ‘ sanctions. And I would conclude, without fear of refutation,  
 ‘ that he who calls in the civil sword to the aid of Christianity,  
 ‘ is dishonouring and betraying, instead of serving the cause of  
 ‘ a *suffering* Messiah, who, when those his sufferings were depre-  
 ‘ cated by his zealous but erring disciple, solemnly reproved his  
 ‘ mistake, saying, “Thou savourest not of the things that be of  
 ‘ “God, but *those that be of men*,” and who commanded that  
 ‘ same disciple to “put up his sword into its sheath.”’\*

This argument, however, affects only those Christians who believe that the spirit of Christianity is opposed to religious persecution. And they are, as we have already stated, a small and a recent minority. We believe that the duty of abstaining from the forcible propagation of religious truth may be maintained by an argument of universal application,—one to which a Mahometan or a Pagan must yield, as well as a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. It consists in the impossibility, in almost all cases, in demonstrating that what is persecuted is really error. We have already remarked that most of the disputes which separate Christian sects relate, not to practical morality, but either to questions respecting Church discipline and government, which may receive different answers among different nations and at different times; or to questions as to the nature and attributes of the Deity, and as to his dealings with mankind, which depend on the interpretation given to certain portions of Scripture as to which men have been differing for eighteen centuries, with a tendency rather to further divergence than to agreement.

---

\* Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian, p. 31.

The Trinitarians think that the eternal co-existence of God the Father and God the Son is the scriptural doctrine. The Arians think that the Begetter must have existed before the Begotten. The Latin Church believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Greek Church believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. Each of these opinions has been supported by hundreds of learned, conscientious, and diligent inquirers. Each has been adopted by millions of enthusiastic votaries; each has been propagated by violence, and resisted by endurance; each has had its doctors, its persecutors, and its martyrs.

Among the errors which Protestants impute to Roman Catholics there is one which appears capable of demonstration; for it seems to involve a logical absurdity—the notion that a thing can retain all its attributes and yet be changed in substance. Yet this apparent absurdity is sanctioned by an enormous preponderance of authority. For centuries it was undisputed. Even since it has been called in question, more than three fourths of the Christian world adhere to it.

It is possible that many of the opinions for which we persecute one another relate to matters which our faculties are unable to comprehend. It is possible that if our controversies could be submitted to the decision of beings of higher knowledge and intelligence than those of man, they would tell us that for the most part we are disputing about words which signify no realities, and debating propositions which, being unmeaning, possess neither truth nor falsehood. One thing at least seems clear—that if the Being, who inspired the texts on which different sects found their arguments, had intended us to agree in one interpretation of them, he would not have left them susceptible of many.

The fact, then, on which the expediency of persecution depends—the falsehood of the persecuted doctrine,—being in general incapable of demonstration, it follows, as a general rule, that persecution is not expedient. We say in general, for there are some religious opinions so obviously mischievous, that the magistrate may be bound to put them down. Such are the doctrines once attributed to the church of Rome, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, that the Pope may release subjects from their allegiance, and that indulgences may be purchased for the darkest crimes. And with respect even to such doctrines as these, all that the State ought to prevent is their active dissemination. The mere holding them, being involuntary, is not a fit subject for legislation.

The argument against persecution, of which we have just given an outline, is, however, seldom employed. It may be

worth our while to inquire why this is so: why, among the thousands who have argued against persecution, scarcely any have made use of a train of reasoning which appears to us to be obvious and conclusive.

We believe that the explanation is to be found in the peculiar state of mind with which men approach religious questions.

On all other questions they are anxious, or, at least, profess to be anxious, to keep themselves in what may be called a state of intellectual candour. They affirm that they are open to argument, and that they wish to hear what is to be said on both sides.\* Even in matters in which each step is a matter of certainty, they distrust their own judgment as soon as their conclusions are questioned by a competent authority. A man who has added up a column of figures, doubts the accuracy of the operation, if an accountant has examined it and tells him that he has committed an error.

On religious questions this state of mind is avoided by most men and disclaimed by all. On such subjects most men try to feel, and all profess to feel, perfect certainty. They do not pretend to be open to reason; they do not wish to hear what is to be said against their opinion; they are afraid of unsettling their faith. They are not startled when they are told that views different from their own are taken by men whose talents, integrity, and diligence render them competent judges. A Protestant cares nothing for the authority of Bossuet or Pascal, or a Tractarian for that of Whately or Hampden. Every man clings to his faith, as if it were unassailable, yet screens it from opposition as if the first hostile breath would overthrow it.

The source of these feelings is the opinion, — first held by the Jews, and adopted from them by both Christians and Mahometans, — that religious error not merely leads to sinful practice, but is in itself actually a sin: and it is remarkable that the errors which are generally supposed to be most sinful are not those which predispose to conduct hurtful to ourselves or to others, — such as the belief that the favour of God is to be obtained

---

\* 'In entering upon any scientific pursuit, one of the student's first endeavours ought to be to strengthen himself by something of an effort and a resolve for the unprejudiced admission of any conclusion which shall appear to be supported by observation and argument, even if it should prove adverse to notions he may have previously formed or taken up on the credit of others. Such an effort is the first approach towards mental purity. It is the "euphrasy" and "rue" with which we must purge our sight before we can receive and contemplate as they are the lineaments of truth.' — *Sir John Herschel's 'Astronomy.'* Introduction.

by self-torment,—or by persecuting those whom we assume to be his enemies,—but mere speculative doctrines, which have no influence on human actions. The Athanasian Creed requires whosoever will be saved, not to love God and his neighbour, but ‘to think rightly of the Trinity.’ Men who believe, that all who do not keep holy and undefiled this very technical faith without doubt shall perish everlastingly, must tremble at every doubt that intrudes itself. Those whose confidence in their own opinions is perfect rejoice in the firmness of their belief; those who are assailed by doubts endeavour to suppress them, and to assume a conviction which they do not feel; and thus the members of every sect agree to treat as a matter of perfect certainty the points of its peculiar faith. Every writer and speaker, therefore, who has to consider the propriety of enforcing his faith by persecution, begins by affirming or implying,—if he be a Roman Catholic, that the Protestant doctrines,—if he be a Protestant, that the Roman Catholic doctrines, are certainly false: and he then finds it difficult to show why falsehood should not be suppressed.

The title of the tenth chapter—on the abuses of the principle of authority—is perhaps almost a misnomer, for the principal subject is not the abuse, but the use of authority. The abuses of authority, indeed, are obvious; and, up to a certain point, they have a tendency to increase as a nation advances in knowledge and civilisation. Among barbarians the subjects of thought are few: a savage takes his religion on trust, but almost all his other opinions are the result of his experience; and therefore, among savages, the oldest man is generally the wisest. In an advanced state of civilisation, the amount of knowledge may be said to be practically infinite; since it is far greater than could be acquired in the longest life, or received into the most capacious intellect. The mass of the people have not sufficient general knowledge, or sufficient leisure to enable them to test the truth of one thousandth part of the propositions which come before them every day; and they acquire the habit of torpidly acquiescing in what they hear or read, provided their informant be one whom they are accustomed to trust. Those who mix with the English labouring classes, particularly with those who are supposed to be the most intelligent,—the manufacturers,—are at first astonished by the slavishness with which they adopt the views and obey the orders of those to whom they look up as leaders. Whole bodies of workpeople abandon their employment,—expose themselves, their wives and children, to distress, hunger, and disease, which may never be shaken off,—combine to ruin the master who has been their benefactor for years,—insult,

maltreat, and perhaps assassinate their own associates, who do not join in the strike,—and all this, at the dictation of persons whose names are often concealed from them; but whose anonymous orders carry the authority of the committees of the union. During the comparatively tranquil intervals between strike and strike they suffer from their self-constituted rulers an amount of interference, of taxation, and of capricious oppression which would produce a rebellion in Russia or Turkey. Under the influence of this despotism they have seen the manufactures of great towns, as in the case of Dublin, indeed of great countries, as in the case of Ireland, gradually perish or withdraw. The reasonings which are addressed to them by their superiors, the calamities which they witness among their equals, even those which they have endured and are enduring themselves, have no weight when opposed by the authority of their own delegates and committeemen.

We will pass to a still more striking example. The wretchedness of Ireland is generally attributed to the misgovernment of England; and this is certainly the ultimate, but not the immediate cause. From the Union,—that is to say, during all the time that is recollected by the present generation,—Ireland has enjoyed a pure administration of justice, local self-government, free institutions, and the lightest taxation in Europe. England has wasted and is wasting her treasures in her defence, in the support and education of her people, and in unrepaid loans for her improvement. She has been the spoilt child of the empire. But the insolent injustice with which we have treated, and continue to treat her religion, has led the bulk of the people to withdraw their confidence from the Government, and from all connected with the Government, and to trust blindly to their own priests and demagogues. Under such influence they have been engaged in a chronic conspiracy against the law and its administrators. Neither persons nor property have been safe. Agrarian outrage has rendered agricultural improvement impossible; the atrocities committed by the trades-unions have driven away manufactures; capital, credit, and commerce have disappeared. The landlord has emigrated and been replaced by the agent; the manufacturer has established himself in a safer country; the merchant has followed his customers. Blindly obeying the orders of those whom they have put in authority over them, this unhappy people has wasted in agitation and outrage the energy which might have made Clare and Tipperary as prosperous as Down or Antrim. When we see such consequences flow from obedience to ill-chosen guides in our own islands,—when we see the misery which within the last two years the people of Italy,

Germany, and France have been induced by a few thousand ruffians and fanatics to inflict and to suffer, — we are inclined to prefer the ignorance of the self-relying Arab, to the slavish subservience with which the mass of the population of some of the most civilised portions of Europe submit to the authority of their leaders.

At the same time we agree with Mr. Lewis, that one of the main instruments of civilisation is well-placed confidence. We agree also in the opinions contained in the striking passage with which he concludes his essay.

‘ Well-placed confidence, in questions of opinion and conduct, is what sound credit is in mercantile affairs. Credit does not create wealth, neither does confidence create rectitude of judgment. The material commodity, and the mental capacity, must both pre-exist; but, in each case, the confidence turns it to the best account, and converts to a useful purpose that which might otherwise be locked up unproductively in the coffers or in the breast of its possessor.

‘ In the present state of the civilised world the progress of society will depend in part upon legislative improvement, and upon those measures which a government can command or influence; but it will depend still more upon the substitution of competent for incompetent guides of public opinion; upon the continued extension of their influence; and upon the consequent organisation of a sound authority in all the departments of theory and practice. Under the operation of these influences, it will be found that the increased mental activity which accompanies progressive civilisation is not inconsistent with social tranquillity; that the extension of knowledge among the people does not promote anarchical doctrines; and that the principle of moral authority is too strong for the principle of political revolution.’\*

We are ready, too, to admit that the solitary meditations of the uneducated seldom lead them to correct conclusions. The religious opinions which they frame for themselves are generally gloomily superstitious; the political ones are warped by the plausible error that poverty is caused by the unequal distribution of wealth, and might be removed by a more equitable arrangement; and their moral notions are usually hasty generalisations from a very limited experience. And if this be so, it follows that the first step towards improvement depends upon the selection of trustworthy guides. But, as respects the mass of mankind, we have no approach towards such a selection. As long as they are ready to worship a Thoms, an O’Connell, or a Barbès — until an education very different in kind as well as in amount has brought them to select their idols better, — we can scarcely wish them to repose their confidence more readily. Mr. Lewis’s comparison of moral confidence to commercial



credit is a happy illustration. Each contributes materially to the improvement of mankind; each, indeed, is essential to any considerable advance of civilisation; but ill-placed confidence and ill-placed credit are at least as mischievous as well-placed credit and confidence are beneficial.

We cannot take leave of this collection of suggestive remarks and acute inferences which has engaged us so long without frankly admitting the meagre inadequacy of the representation which we have given of it. Mr. Lewis has treated or alluded to so many subjects, he has opened so many views, often into unexplored regions, that we have been forced to select for comment only a very small portion of them. He will be studied, however, far more in his own pages than in ours; and if we have had any readers to whom his work was unknown, we have extracted from it enough to lead them to the original.

ART. IX.—1. *Debate on the Address.* 1850.

2. *Speeches at Protection Meetings.* 1849–50.

3. *Address of the National Association for the Protection of Industry.* 1850.

4. *Board of Trade Returns for the Year 1849.*

THERE is no reason either for being, or affecting to be, surprised at the agriculturists—or, perhaps we should rather say, those noisy politicians who usurp the name of a very tranquil class of men—having closed their account with the past twelve months in a storm of angry discontent. ‘Agricultural distress’ is no new thing; and, at the present moment, there [probably] is considerable actual suffering,—as we dare say, also was the case at all the other periods when similar cries were raised. It is far from our thoughts to deal lightly or tauntingly with complaints coming from a body of the community possessing such strong and ancient claims to general respect and kindly feeling. On the contrary, we propose, in a spirit of friendship and scrupulous fairness, to inquire how far the sufferings complained of may be temporary in their causes, as well as exaggerated in their statement; using, for the investigation, not general principles and broad conclusions—on which we might most fairly take our stand as on an invincible position—but only some palpable and homely facts belonging to the present time and circumstances: such as, if not beyond denial, are at least within the reach of simple and accessible tests. First, however, we would, by a very condensed compendium of the *history* of agricultural complaints, guard

against the assumption, that complaints like the present are anything new among the complaining class; or that they necessarily, or even presumptively, arise from anything new in legislation. For surely it is a most suggestive fact that, whatever may be at present the actual suffering of the agriculturist, his complaints, with but few and short intervals, were as bitter under the system which has ended, as they are under that which has begun.

In March, 1815,—the avenues to the Houses of Parliament at the time being filled with military and police,—it was enacted that no wheat should be imported into Britain till the average price of the kingdom was above 80*s.* per quarter. Several such proposals as one by the late Lord Ashburton, to fix 76*s.* instead of 80*s.* for the minimum, were rejected by overwhelming majorities. They were treated as mere panderings to public clamour, a betrayal of the agricultural interest, and an act of contempt towards a committee of the previous session, which (guided by the evidence of a number of leading agriculturists) had affirmed that wheat could not possibly be grown in this country at any price below 80*s.*, or rather 82*s.* 6*d.* In the following December the monthly average was 55*s.* 9*d.*, or 30 per cent. below the minimum decreed by the legislature in March! As soon as the preliminaries of the next session were hurried over, Mr. Western, member for Essex, ‘rose to bring under notice the distressed state of the agriculture of the United Kingdom.’ He began:—‘Between two and three years ago agriculture was in a prosperous and flourishing state, and yet within the short period which has since elapsed, thousands have been already ruined, and destruction seems to impend over all those whose capital is engaged in the cultivation of the soil!’ He moved resolutions declaring that all connected with agriculture ‘are at present suffering under unexampled distress;’ a proposition which was unanimously adopted by the House. This was in March, 1816, when wheat was 54*s.* 6*d.*; in May, though not in virtue of the parliamentary resolution, it was up again at 74*s.* 6*d.* Incendiary fires and similar outrages broke forth, soon afterwards, throughout the chief agricultural districts. In the Isle of Ely alone four agricultural labourers were hanged on one gallows, and several others shot, for participation in one of these riots; ‘a reduction in the price of bread and meat,’ says an impartial contemporary chronicler, ‘was the avowed object of the rioters, and their flags were inscribed with “Bread or Blood.”’ By the end of 1816 the average price was 103*s.*, and the annual average for the next year was 94*s.* 4½*d.*; so that the landlords in the legis-

lature did not complain, although distress petitions came in, in large numbers, from farmers and labourers: and the period was one of almost unparalleled suffering to the community at large, and of anxiety to their rulers. In 1818, with an average of 84s. 2d., and in 1819 with an average of 72s. 2d.,—with the Habeas Corpus Act suspended, and with the Six Acts, Special Commissions, and the hangman, in active operation throughout the country,—there were frequent complaints from farmers and labourers, but no organised efforts to obtain ‘relief.’ In 1820, the annual average being 67s. 10d., Parliament was inundated with agricultural petitions praying for ‘a higher protective duty,’ and averring that foreign corn was ‘smuggled’ out of the bonding warehouses. The appointment of a Select Committee to consider these petitions was carried even against the wishes of the ministry; but the Committee, after sitting a couple of months, reported that they could detect nothing and devise nothing.

And here, having completed the first six years’ history of the Corn-law, let us in a single sentence sum up its dismal and instructive testimony. All importation was prohibited, till wheat had risen above 80s.; and, though prices fluctuated violently between 53s. and 112s., the average for the six years was 78s. 3d., or more than double the natural price, that is, the world’s-market price, for the period in question. For four years out of the six, we did not (deducting re-exports) import a single quarter of foreign grain; and at the end of the sixth year, when agricultural murmurs were louder than ever, and louder than *now*, there had been no imports for two years, nor was a single quarter of foreign grain lying in bond. The country, meanwhile, was more than once on the very brink of famine and rebellion.

In 1821 (wheat at 56s.) ‘agricultural distress petitions’ again poured in; and a motion in the Commons for the appointment of another Committee, ‘to take into consideration the petitions ‘relative to the distress of the agricultural interests,’ was again carried. But here the landlords were taken in their own devices. The Committee presented a very elaborate report, declaring that, as the ports had been absolutely and continuously shut against foreign grain for thirty months, the agricultural distress could not have arisen from importation; that the remedies asked for by the petitioners were ‘founded on delusion, and ‘likely to lead to disappointment,’—since ‘Protection cannot be ‘carried farther than monopoly;’ and that the Committee would rather suggest a relaxation, in the shape of a fixed duty not prohibitory. The year 1822 (wheat 44s. 7d.—only 5d. higher

under *prohibition* than it was last year under open ports!) began with agricultural railing more extravagant than ever; the country gentlemen at the county meetings insisting on ascribing the low price to 'foreign importations,'—although not a single quarter of foreign grain had come in for more than three years,—and desperately talking about such remedies as National Bankruptcy and Parliamentary Reform. Another Committee was appointed: but it separated, unable to do more than discourse vaguely about a 'sliding-scale,'—an ingenious artifice, which the complainers scouted as not being likely to keep out foreign grain more effectually than the prohibition under 80s., of which they were already in the enjoyment or endurance. During the session six different proposals for amending the Corn-law, besides one, emanating from the country party, for defrauding the national creditor, were discussed and declined by the House of Commons. The circumstances of 1823 were very similar; the time of Parliament being mainly occupied with (to use the phrase we find dancing through all the debates of that period) 'the great question of agricultural depression.' In 1824 and 1825 agricultural lamentations, though not ceasing, were comparatively mild and cautious,—apparently not because the malcontents were less dissatisfied, but because they were more afraid.

We are now at the close of the eleventh year of Protection, or, rather, Prohibition; and what do we find? We find that, with high prices, low prices, and medium prices, the grievances of the agriculturists continued invariably the same; and that with the whole legislative power in their own hands, they never discovered a legislative remedy.

With 1826 the new period may be reckoned to have set in. Owing to the growing strength of the trading and manufacturing classes, and in some degree also to the increased intelligence and repeated experience of the agriculturists themselves, the Protectionists began to stand on the defensive rather than on the aggressive; and they seem prudently to have set about considering what might be done by concessions rather than by attempting new exactions. Nevertheless, through all changes of laws and prices, the croak from the left was as melancholy and ominous as ever. They complained up till 1828, when the sliding-scale was enacted: and they went on complaining after it. In 1833 the Marquis of Chandos exhausted his eloquence in deploring their sufferings, and a Committee, presided over by Sir James Graham, again described their condition as dismal and helpless in the extreme; in 1834 (wheat down at 46s.) the topic was again copiously expatiated upon; in 1835 (no imports, but yet wheat 39s. 4d. on the annual ave-

rage, and 35s. 4d. in December!) petitions once more crowded in, and Lord Chandos renewed his distress motions; in 1836 another Committee of Inquiry was appointed, with, of course, the same melancholy evidence as before (relieved, however, by more cheerful statements from the Scotch farmers), and the same utter absence of any parliamentary panacea. From the last-named year to 1841 the agriculturists kept their troubles comparatively in the back-ground;—it seems to have been suspected that it might be impolitic to parade their weakness in the face of a growing and advancing enemy. They thought they did enough—they now think they did too much—when in 1841 they rejected proudly and revengefully the proposal by the Melbourne Ministry of an 8s. fixed duty. In 1842 came Sir Robert Peel's modification of the sliding-scale, and the Cattle and Provision Tariff. The New Corn-law speedily furnished a fresh instance of the futility of all such laws. Sir Robert Peel, while repudiating generally the idea that legislation can ensure a certain price, stated the *probable* price under his scale at 56s.; and, during the three years for which the scale lasted, it stood respectively, 50s. 1d., 51s. 3d., 50s. 10d. In 1846 came the end, or, at least, the beginning of the end. After an interval, consisting of the close of 1847 and the commencement of 1848, a period marked by the absence of even the 1s. duty,—the cry of agricultural distress again resounded throughout the land and legislature; though not more loudly, nor, as we believe, more reasonably, than it was wont to do in the palmy days of Protection and Prohibition.

Is there any parallel to this strange narrative in the case of any trade, save Agriculture? and of any system, save Protection? It is not easy to conceive that any sober agriculturist can read it,—much less the whole history of which we have given but a crushed and imperfect epitome,—without feeling something, not only of shame, but something also of a serious call upon him for reflection and reconsideration. For three years preceding 1846, the agriculturists had a sliding-scale, devised by their own friends—and then they were distressed; for fifteen years preceding 1842, they had a more rigid sliding-scale, also of their own devising—and then they were even more distressed; while, for the twelve years preceding 1827, under a virtual prohibition and no imports, they had been the most distressed of all. We tell the tale simply as they themselves have told it to us, in Parliamentary debates and public documents; and we believe that, to some extent and as regards the tenantry and labourers, the tale may be a true one. Many, perhaps, will at once conclude from such a narrative, that the agriculturists have cried 'Wolf' much too often to be entitled to attention now. But all the use we seek

to make of it is, that it at least establishes such a case of suspicion, that we may demand a patient hearing for a few simple facts and suggestions from an opposite point of view,—assuming indeed, for the moment, that the agriculturists never cry but when they are hurt. To our mind what we are about to state fully warrants the belief that—as, in times past, the possession of Protection was certainly never found a preventive of agricultural distress—the want of Protection may possibly not be the real cause of that distress at present.

There is a strong resemblance between the circumstances which immediately followed the imposition of Protection in 1815, and those which have immediately followed its removal in 1846,—so strong that it is well worth the consideration of all persons, who insist on ascribing every variation in the price of food to legislative enactments. In the spring of 1815, when Mr. Robinson passed his bill, prohibiting importation till the price was above 80s., the price stood at 72s. The body of consumers were in alarm lest they might be unable to purchase food: but in December, the price was down to 55s. ! It was now the turn for terrified agriculturists to proclaim that they were ruined;—yet, in another twelvemonth prices ran up to above 100s. In the winter of 1845, when Sir Robert Peel resolved to abolish the Corn-law, a famine was apprehended: but by the time his bill passed, in 1846, the price was 50s. The agriculturists again cried ruin, and in six months wheat again rose above 100s. In the London Corn Exchange, on the 17th May, 1847, new Essex and Kent wheat actually brought 114s.,—a height, indeed, which it had scarcely reached for thirty years preceding. At the present moment it is below 40s., which is certainly very low;—though not so low as the existing generation have twice seen it. Thus we see that, within the range of a few months in each case, Prohibition did not prevent wheat falling to 50s. nor Free-trade its rising to 114s.

Coming with the lights of such a history as the above to the inquiry,—what will be the probable effect of Free-trade on agricultural prices?—we perceive at the outset that we might, so far as the Free-trade era has yet run, dispense with the instruction they supply. Free-trade began, not with 1849, but with 1847; the months of that and the following year, during which Sir Robert Peel's vanishing scale of 1846 was in operation, being counterbalanced by those during which the 1s. duty, and even the Navigation-laws, were suspended. Leaving out of the calculation the year 1846, which was partly under the old and partly under the new system, the average of the first three years of Free-trade, (1847-8-9,) was 54s. 10d., while that of the last

three years of Protection, (1843-4-5,) was only 50*s.* 8½*d.* It is not reasonable that the agriculturists should look only at the fact, that under Free-trade they got no more than 44*s.* 2*d.* in 1849, and should insist on forgetting that under the same system they got as much as 69*s.* 9*d.* in 1847. But, for argument's sake, we consent to take the case as they present it, and to deal with the low prices of 1849, although it would be just as fair to take Protection prices as represented by those of 1822 and 1835, — years in which prices, without any imports at all, went down even lower than they have done of late, notwithstanding that our late imports have been, as we shall try to show, unnaturally and accidentally large.

Our first reason for believing that agriculturists need not be cast down by last year's prices, is that, as regards the amount of home as well as of foreign supply, the circumstances have been special and extraordinary; perhaps not at all more likely to recur than the opposite circumstances of 1847.

The very great extent to which an increase of home production, either by a plentiful harvest or an increase of tillage, affects the market, is a point on which agriculturists, or at least agricultural alarmists, have, from the beginning of time to the present, remained singularly blind and unbelieving. They can conceive of no cause for reduced prices, save 'the foreigner.' It is plain, however, that the great and, on the whole, gradual fall of prices between 1815 and 1825 could only have arisen from the extension of tillage and acreable produce. For importation, even under famine prices, was prohibited, and our actual imports, during the whole twenty years, were not a third of what took place last year alone. Yet, with these facts before them, and with this additional fact tolerably well established — that tillage, including in the phrase both reclaimed land and the increase of produce per acre, had during the period in question increased somewhere about 40 per cent., — everything was ascribed by the complainers of twenty and thirty years ago to the importation which demonstrably and notoriously did not exist, and nothing to the causes which did exist, and which were the work of their own hands. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that, with such importations as those of last year, they should be able to look at nothing else. Although we have never seen any weight conceded to the fact by our present complainers, yet neither have we seen them ever venture to deny, that the harvest of 1849, especially the wheat harvest, was an abundant one, and considerably above the average. The proportion in which it exceeded an average, and even the preliminary question what *is* an average, are points which, to the discredit of all engaged in the trade of agriculture, there

are no available means of ascertaining. The Manchester manufacturer will at any time make a pretty close approximation to the produce of the coming crop of cotton in Georgia, as well as to its produce in past seasons; but the British agriculturist has no data whatever for estimating the produce of his own native soil for any one year, nor hitherto has he much troubled himself even to guess. We shall not, therefore, attempt to speculate on the proportion which last year's crop bore to an average one. But, contenting ourselves with the admitted fact that there was *an* increase, would beg due attention to the truth,—that what, stated proportionally, seems a small increase, may both greatly lower the market, and yet compensate the grower, or nearly so,—in short, that an increase of produce which seems very small, may counterbalance a decrease of price which seems very great. An increase such as that of which we are speaking, whether a twelfth or a fourth, arising from the fertility of a favourable season, falls to be calculated, not on what is, in an ordinary year, the *marketable* produce, but on the ordinary *gross* produce, which is at least one fourth more,—the quantity set aside for horses, servants, seed, &c. in the process of production being no greater than if the produce had been only an average one or below it. Keeping this in view, it will be found by any one who makes the calculation on the proper data within his reach, that if last year's 'yield' were taken as a fifth—or even a sixth—above the average, the producers would have, from the crop and the prices of 1849, as much money as they got from the average crops and the prices of the last years of Protection. We are not entitled to insist that a fifth or sixth was the actual surplus above an average; but,—it being admitted that there was some increase, and it being undeniable that any increase operates in the mode we have indicated,—we are warranted in asserting that the fact ought not, as hitherto, to be kept entirely out of sight and consideration.\*

Another quality of the harvest of 1849 has had an unprecedentedly great, though it was not an unavoidable, effect in depressing prices. The grain, and especially the wheat, was got in in damp condition, not permanently damaged, but greatly deteriorated as regards *immediate* use. The condition of last

---

\* In addition to the increase arising from a favourable season, it should likewise be taken into account that there is reason to believe that, under the stimulus of the higher prices of 1847, there was prepared and seeded in 1848 for the crop of 1849 a greater than ordinary breadth of wheat. Every year our improvements in cultivation, especially our extended draining, must be telling more and more.



year's wheat, at least till within six weeks of the issue of this number of the Review, has, even in some of the best wheat districts of the country, been such that only one third of it was fit to be used in the manufacture of good bread—a proportion almost unprecedentedly low. The effect of this temporary postponement of demand for new wheat has been greater than any person not having special knowledge of the particulars would imagine; but some evidence of it may be seen in the fact that for several months (say from November to February inclusive) the price of the best *new* wheat has been 6*s.* or 8*s.* a quarter below good old or foreign. If the farmers had held back the bulk of their produce till the present time, when it is coming into as good condition as that which has been fetching an additional 6*s.* or 8*s.* (or, allowing for the greater bulkiness of the damp article, say 4*s.* or 5*s.*), their year's profits would have been so much higher, or, if they choose, their year's loss so much less. But, as the market returns and the state of the stocks on hand show, they have been selling with even more than ordinary haste. And why? Probably, at least, for one reason,—because the capital of so many of them is too small for their operations. This is a case, in which a deficiency of capital subjects the party to a double disadvantage. The lower the market, so much the more certainly is he forced into it, as a seller; and the more numerous the sellers, the lower still will the market be depressed. But another, and probably even a more powerful cause of the glutting of the market, and consequent depression of prices, has been the *panic*,—a panic born of folly and of faction. The immediate propagators of it are fairly chargeable with the consequences. The farmers who were persuaded by their 'friends' to sell in January an article, which might have brought 15 per cent. more if kept till April, have only their 'friends' to blame.

The fact of the existence, and the extent of the effects, of the Corn Panic of 1849 admit of being indirectly illustrated and estimated by the facts connected with the Cattle Panic of 1842. In 1842, Sir Robert Peel's first tariff reform admitted, though at still heavy duties, Live Animals and articles of Provision; which before were, some literally and others virtually, prohibited. Instantly cries of rage and ruin were raised, and prices fell heavily;—the farmers bitterly expressing the latter fact by the phrase, 'Peel's in the market.' We have no more accurate mode of showing the fall of price at this time than by taking the medium price of butcher's meat in Smithfield market, before and during the panic; though this does not sufficiently represent the fall, the price of butcher's meat never following closely, nor to the full extent, the fall in the price of the live animal,

especially when that fall is occasioned by some such cause only, as a panic. In the year preceding 1842, the medium price of beef at Smithfield was 4s. 0 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per stone of 8lbs.; in the three years following the change, it was respectively, 3s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 3s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 3s. 0 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. That of mutton, the year preceding, was 4s. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.; the three years following, 3s. 8d., 3s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 3s. 3 $\frac{5}{8}$ d. That of pork, the year preceding, was 4s. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; the three years following, 3s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 3s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 3s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. In the gross, there was a fall of about 20 per cent. That this was the effect of panic—co-operating, however, with some distress among the consumers—and had no real connexion with importation, is clear from the fact, that the quantity of provisions imported during the period was inconsiderable, and the number of live animals brought over really not worth reckoning. Even those few came over, for the most part, mere skin and bone, and their flesh had to be put on them here by British food and for British profit. We maintain that the Corn Panic of last year differs from the Cattle Panic of 1842 in little but this;—that owing to the natural difference in the subjects and the circumstances, it has operated still more injuriously to the interests of the panic-stricken. The cattle panic only threw the home-reared cattle on the market, under circumstances and at times which depreciated their saleable value; for their foreign rivals were not in the country nor in existence. But when the Corn Panic came, the warehouses (for causes we shall presently touch on), were filled with grain belonging to capitalists, and waiting for a high or remunerative market. The panic among the home-growers went lengths which baffled all previous calculation. It knocked down the market week after week and month after month, till there seemed neither stop to it nor bottom: nor did it stop till, partly through the infection of alarm, partly from the inability of many to hold out longer, it had brought down the reserved stocks also, like an avalanche, on the market. Here, then, in part at least, and taken along with the extent both of the panic and of the increase of our produce of home-growth, we have an explanation of the phenomenon that, for some time, foreign grain sold in Britain cheaper than in the countries from which it came.

We are now brought to the question—what have been the causes, the amount, and the effect of the imports of last year? It is demonstrable that the circumstances of 1849 were still more exceptional with regard to importation than with regard to home production; but we must pass rapidly over this part of the subject. The scarcity of 1847, which occasioned not only England, but France, Belgium, and other countries, to appear

as purchasers at enormous prices over all the world, undoubtedly gave a great stimulus to production in the exporting regions the following year. At the same time revolutions, and rumours of revolutions, overspread these regions, causing decrease of home consumption and insecurity of property; and drove the growers or holders of corn to England, as almost the only country where industry and order seemed likely to be preserved, — and where, also, by a chance coincidence, the always exaggerated allurements of a new and wealthy market was now opened to them. It will surely be admitted that these circumstances are exceptional; — that it is not often we have a year of such severe and general scarcity as 1847, nor one of so many revolutions as 1848. Concurring with, or following upon all this, we had in 1848, and again in 1849, unusually abundant harvests, and, consequently, low prices, both in France and Belgium; enabling these countries, which usually import, to become exporters. In France, for three years preceding 1848, the price of wheat was as high as during the same period in our own country; for ten years preceding, the average was 51s. 2d.; but, last year, it fell to 33s. 8d. France thus became, for the year, what she was not before, and what, as the facts we have just stated prove, she cannot ordinarily, or almost ever become — an exporting country: so much so, that she actually sent us the *largest* quantity of grain. Belgium, still more strictly an importing country, also sent us a large quantity. It appears indeed that nearly one-third of the whole of our last year's import of wheat came from these two countries, — countries, from which we cannot ordinarily obtain any supply whatever.\* We submit, that these are facts which alarmists should not persist in obstinately ignoring, and from which agriculturists only seeking the truth may derive courage and consolation.

As regards our imports from those countries which ordinarily do afford a surplus, it is easy to prove that, at recent prices, they have not paid, and therefore cannot be continued. The general fact that, during 1848, as well as 1849, importation from the ordinary continental grain ports has been a losing speculation, is notorious; but, preferring particular facts and instances, we shall

---

\* Belgium may, irrespective of her own harvests, become *now* an exporting instead of an occasionally importing country: for, the railway communication, which is completed to her frontiers, especially that to the Rhine at Cologne, must divert from Rotterdam part of the supplies formerly sent there for export. This, however, will not be a new source of supply, but only the substitution of a new outlet for the produce of the Upper Rhine.

show, by authenticated and unquestionable figures, the condition of the foreign grain trade as it stood in the beginning of March, and pretty nearly as it has stood since harvest, in the chief grain port (except London) on the east coast. The following statement, which has been minutely tested, needs no explanation. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sanders may compare it with their conflicting returns.

Dantzic, 10th February, 1850 :—

High mixed wheat 60 @ 62 lbs. per bushel f.o.b. - 37s. @ 40s. p. qr.

Average weight 60 lbs. average price 38s. 6d.

*Charges :—*

Freight - - - 3s. 6d.

Insurance at 3 guineas premium - 1s. 2d.

Sound dues - - - 0s. 5d.

Bank charges for paying in London 0s. 3d.

Loss on measure, and shore dues - 0s. 6d.

Making up weight to 62 lbs. (the usual selling weight in Leith for *white* wheat), from 61 lbs. the natural average weight, say 1 lb. per bushel - - - 0s. 9d.

Duty - - - 1s. 0d.

Factor's commission - - 2s. 0d.

9s. 7d.

Nett cost *ex ship* in Leith - - - 47s. 1d.

Nett cost *ex warehouse*—add 1s. per quarter for warehousing and delivering day - - 48s. 1d.

Selling price at corresponding date in the British port - - - 46s. 0d.

Rostock, 9th February, 1850 :—

Finest wheat 63 lbs per bushel f.o.b. - - 36s. @ 36s. 6d. p. qr.

Average price - 36s. 3d.

Charges as from Dantzic - - 9s. 7d.

Less on freight, being

3s. instead of 3s. 6d.

per quarter - - 6d.

Also less making up

weight, the natural

weight being the sell-

ing weight in Leith,

for red wheat 63 lbs.

9d.

1s. 3d.

8s. 4d.

Nett cost *ex ship* in Leith - - - 44s. 7d.

Nett cost <i>ex warehouse</i> —add as above 1s. per quarter	45s. 7d.
Selling price at corresponding date in British port	44s. 0d.

Lubeck, (Holstein) 15th February, 1850:—

Wheat of 61 lbs. per bushel f.o.b. - 34s. @ 34s. 6d. p. qr.

Average price	34s. 3d.
Charges on the foregoing	9s. 1d.
Add 1 lb. for weight to be made up	0s. 7d.
	<hr/> 9s. 8d.
Nett cost <i>ex ship</i> in Leith	43s. 11d.
Nett cost <i>ex warehouse</i> —add 1s.	44s. 11d.
Selling price at corresponding date in British port	41s.* 0d.

To the expenses of importation, as above stated, should be added about 9d. per quarter for sea risk not covered by the insurance, which is only effectual when the vessel is stranded or the loss total. To London the freights are higher than to the port we have selected; and to west-coast ports, of course, higher still. In round figures we may average the *certain* loss on each quarter of wheat imported during the winter and spring of 1849—1850 as 3s. ~~or~~ 4s., in addition to all such risks as bad debts, &c. The bearing of these facts is obvious. Our agriculturists will surely believe that foreign corn will not be grown and imported at a loss. It is not improbable that foreign production will be checked by the exceptionally low prices and profits (or rather no profits) of 1849, in something like the same degree to which it had been stimulated by the exceptionally high prices and profits of 1847.

Having seen that 1849 was, as regards supply, and still more as regards prices, an exceptional year, we turn now to a more general view of the position and prospects of the British agriculturist. And first, we would call to mind a fact which in the midst of the late alarm and hubbub seems to have dropped, if it has not been carefully thrust, out of sight; namely, that *grain*, in which the British agriculturist is exposed to competition, is not his only product, but that *two-thirds of his whole produce*, consisting of roots, sheep, cattle, &c., are not affected by *Free-trade at all*,—except so far as that system tends to give them an increased demand and enhanced value.

In assigning either a positive or proportional amount to any agricultural product, or in trying to arrive at the total of all the products, we enter on unmapped ground—a fact of the lamentable truth of which we could not give better evidence, than by

merely mentioning that at a meeting of 'the London Farmers' Club,' a few weeks ago, it was gravely doubted and debated whether the annual average home produce of wheat was *seven* or *twenty-four* million quarters. We take for basis the calculations made by Mr. M'Culloch in 1844, which led him thus to state the annual value of the agricultural produce of the three kingdoms:—

From arable land	-	-	-	£138,021,548
From pasture and 'uncultivated' land	-	-	-	89,750,000
				<u>£227,771,548</u>

But this classification is not one exhibiting the facts wanted for the present inquiry, viz. that proportion of agricultural produce which is affected by foreign competition,—namely, the cereals: and that which is unaffected by it,—namely, animals and roots. Taking from the first of the two classes given by Mr. M'Culloch, the following items—Gardens, which do not form a part of 'the agricultural interest;' Turnips and Clover, in which there is not and cannot be any competition worth reckoning; Flax, in which there had been Free-trade ten years before the date of Mr. M'Culloch's estimate; and Potatoes, which are higher than under Protection (but on the Irish portion of which we put only *half* the value ascribed to it by Mr. M'Culloch in 1844);—and adding them to the articles contained in the second line of Mr. M'Culloch's classification, the result stands thus:—

Cattle, cattle-food, roots and other articles (as above) <i>not</i> exposed to foreign competition	£137,295,009
Cereal crops, exposed to competition	- 90,476,539
<u>£227,771,548</u>	

The products, therefore, which are not exposed to competition are about 50 per cent. greater in value than those which are so exposed; and, as Mr. M'Culloch calculated wheat at 52*s.*, and other grains in proportion, while, at the time he wrote, most of the articles in the non-cereal class were *cheaper* than they are now; and also as the proportion of roots to cereals has greatly increased since 1844, both as regards the number of acres under crop and the produce per acre—we think that, making all allowances for roughness of estimates, we are within the mark in stating that two-thirds in value of the annual agricultural produce of Britain is of that class which, in the nature of things, Free-trade cannot injuriously affect.\*

---

\* A similar calculation in another form, and relating to England only, confirms the probability of these proportions. Taking the cereal

Experience has shown, to the satisfaction even of the panic-stricken of 1842, that at least in Live Animals the foreigner cannot successfully compete with us. In every kind of animal (except Lambs and Swine, the number of both of which is insignificant) there has been a gradual and steady decrease in the imports for several years. Last year's import was less than that of 1848, and that again less than the import of 1847. An attempt, however, has been made to supply the place of the Cattle Panic with a Provision Panic. We have been saved from the Live Animal, but only to be trodden down by the Dead. If agriculturists would in this case, too, only look at facts, instead of listening to their fears and fancies, they would soon be reassured. It is plain that in this country, where neither climate nor taste induces a demand for salted food, and where it is the custom for consumers to cure for themselves, the importation of cured provisions—of which all but a mere trifle of the importations consists, and must consist—is certain of finding an early and narrow limit. That limit seems to have been already reached; one or two of the articles of Provision show a decrease last year, none a considerable increase. But, moreover—and this perhaps is the main fact—the actual total quantity is not worth taking into account, in relation to the whole. The import for 1849 of the chief article, Beef, in all its forms, dead and alive, salt and fresh, stands thus:—

Oxen and cows	-	-	-	39,672
Beef, 149,917 cwt. which, at 6 cwt. of market- able meat per animal, gives of animals	-	-	-	24,986
Total number of animals	-	-	-	64,658

The estimated annual consumption of beef in the kingdom is 2,000,000 animals, on which the number imported last year, as just given, is less than  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. In the item of Pigs, the imports, live and dead, are considerably above this proportion; but the item is comparatively a small one,—to say nothing of the fact, that the number of pigs imported from abroad have not nearly filled the gap caused by the falling off in their supply from Ireland. While in the case of the far larger items of Sheep, Lambs, and Calves (taking Live Animals, and Mutton, Lamb, and Veal together), the per-centage of imports on the entire

crops of England at 40,000,000 of quarters—the highest estimate,—30s. a quarter all round will give 60,000,000*l.* of value. Assuming other crops and animals to be worth 120,000,000*l.*, we have a gross produce of 180,000,000*l.* Now this is probably near the mark. For the ordinary supposition, which puts the rental of England at 45,000,000*l.*, and the rent at one-fourth of the gross produce, brings out a gross produce of precisely the same value.

consumption is very much lower than that which we have already mentioned in the great article of Beef. On the whole, the fact is beyond disproof, that the imports of foreign provisions in all shapes, are not above *three per cent. on the consumption*; a proportion so inconsiderable as fully to prove our position,—that, as regards all that class of articles, the British agriculturist is not exposed to competition at all.

But, if more proof is wanted on this important and neglected point, we have it in the history of the prices of the articles in question; which have stood as high under Free-trade as either under Prohibition, or under the duties of 1842. They have, in fact, been more steadily high, except during the panic caused by farmers' 'friends,' than the prices of any other product that can be named. The following figures show the medium price per stone of 8 lbs.,—that is, the price between the average 'top' price and the average lowest price—of meat in Smithfield, during the six years preceding and the six years following the change of 1842:—

	Beef.		Mutton.		Pork.			Beef.		Mutton.		Pork.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
1836	3	10½	4	1½	4	1½	1843	3	4½	3	8	3	8½
1837	3	10½	4	3	4	5	1844	3	1½	3	8½	3	6½
1838	3	9½	4	1½	4	7½	1845	3	0½	3	3½	3	7½
1839	3	11½	4	6½	4	10	1846	3	4½	4	2½	4	3
1840	4	1	4	5½	4	9½	1847	3	11½	4	1½	3	3½
1841	4	0½	4	5½	4	10½	1848	3	7½	4	3½	4	0½

It will be seen how prices fell from mere panic—for the importations were trifling and powerless—in the three years following 1842; and how, when the farmers had cooled down, prices sprang up in 1846 and the following years, towards their former levels; although in 1846, the entire duty,—the slight modification of which had been in 1842 considered certain ruin,—was knocked off at one stroke of Sir Robert's pen.

As regards Sheep (the annual value of which, including wool, is greater than that of Cattle) we happen to possess some perhaps still more reliable data than those which are furnished by the price of butchers' meat in London. There is an estate, almost wholly pastoral, in the South of Scotland,—the rents on which are regulated year by year according to the price of Sheep and Wool; and the prices on which have been ascertained to be a fair average of the three great sheep-rearing counties of Dumfries, Selkirk, and Roxburgh. With the explanation,—that for the first six years Wool was not averaged, and that the price of



Lambs is taken at the medium between the two qualities called 'tops' and 'seconds,' and that the breed is the Cheviot,—we give the following table, compiled from the books of the estate alluded to, as showing the price of Sheep in one of the principal districts, and, *proportionately* at least, for the whole country, during the last thirty-three years:—

	Wool p. st.		Lambs.		Dft. Ewes.			Wool p. st.		Lambs.		Dft. Ewes.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
1817	—		5	10	15	0	1834	38	0	10	6	21	6
1818	—		13	0	24	6	1835	30	0	8	8½	19	0
1819	—		11	4½	25	0	1836	33	6	8	7	16	6
1820	—		10	6	21	4	1837	23	0	9	8½	18	0
1821	—		5	10½	12	6	1838	32	0	9	1½	17	0
1822	—		5	10½	11	0	1839	30	0	7	10½	18	0
1823	21	0	6	1½	11	3	1840	22	6	8	6	18	6
1824	22	0	5	9	13	6	1841	25	0	9	8	20	0
1825	28	0	9	9	22	0	1842	21	9	7	2½	13	6
1826	15	6	5	9	11	6	1843	20	0	6	3	13	6
1827	16	6	6	7½	16	0	1844	28	0	9	1½	16	0
1828	16	0	8	2	15	0	1845	28	0	10	6	18	0
1829	14	0	6	7½	14	6	1846	25	0	10	7½	21	0
1830	16	6	4	8½	10	3	1847	22	6	12	1½	22	9
1831	24	6	5	10	15	6	1848	16	0	10	3	19	6
1832	21	0	8	3	14	0	1849	20	6	8	10	17	6
1833	32	0	9	0½	20	6							

Here, again, we have the same feature, as we have just seen brought out by the Smithfield prices—a great fall caused by the causeless panic following the change of 1842; and then a rise to a higher level than before, under the system of entire Free-trade commencing in 1846. It is remarkable, however, that, even including the three or four years of panic, the average of the six years following the removal of Prohibition has been greater than the average of the six years preceding:—

	Wool.		Lambs.		Draft Ewes.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Prohibition—1836–1841	27	7½	8	10½	18	0
Free Trade—1843–1848	26	0½	11	3½	18	5½

The only decline here is in Wool; but since the latest of these dates, the price of wool has (even by the admission of Sir J. Trollope, the mover of the Protectionist amendment to the address,) risen 25 per cent. This rise may be safely received as a set-off against the fall last year in the other non-cereal articles;—the cause of which (whatever it may have been) was not importation. It is also worth noticing that, of the three years following entire Free-trade, the prices of one of them

(1848) have been higher than those of any year save one since 1835; and of another, (1847,) higher than any year since 1819. We do not know of any other article of extensive production and consumption, in behalf of which a similar statement can be made.

To what has been here adduced, many similar though smaller facts might be added. Of dairy produce—butter and cheese—the imports decreased last year. No roots are imported, except Potatoes; and of the price of these not even the most morbid grumbler can complain. The price of working horses is 50 per cent. higher than ten years ago,—although, in 1835, a Committee of the House of Commons, in its eagerness to aggravate agricultural griefs, estimated that railways would cause that particular species of stock to sink two-thirds in demand and value.

Here, then, we have the important and half-forgotten fact demonstrated, that *two-thirds in value of the annual agricultural produce have been and will be unaffected by importation*,—the greater part of those two-thirds being also of high value in cheapening and increasing, by the supply of manure, the production of the remainder.

Coming to the assertion so often made that, in the other third of their produce, our agriculturists cannot, under Free-trade, maintain competition with the foreigner, we beg to recall another fact, which it is the custom to forget or wilfully pass over—namely, that Free-trade and other recent changes, if they have done something *against* the British agriculturist, have also done something *for* him. From the language of our alarmists, it might be inferred that agriculturists had everything to sell and nothing to buy, and that no produce has fallen in price but theirs. A valuable paper, read by Mr. Porter at the last meeting of the British Association, however, shows that the price of everything which the agriculturist eats, drinks, or wears, has fallen in a much greater proportion than the price of that one-third of his produce which alone has fallen at all. Then, various seeds and foreign feeding stuffs, formerly liable to duty, now come in either free or at greatly reduced rates. For instance, the reduction of the duty on grass seeds from 21s. to 5s. per cent., is equal to 2s. 3d. on every acre sown with grass in Scotland, Ireland, and the North of England; while linseed cake, the free use of which on a farm tends more than anything else—not even excepting guano, to which the farmer owes so much—to increase the produce of his cereals, has fallen at least 50 per cent. within the last few years. Another advantage which has been conferred on agriculturists by Free-trade, and which is certainly entitled to some consideration, is its tendency to give pros-

perity to their only customers, — a point we shall refer to presently, in connexion with another part of the subject. A further advantage, and an immense one, is the tendency of Free-trade to produce *steadiness* of price. The wider the market, the steadier the price. Besides which, all contrivances artificially to narrow the market miscarry sooner or later. The Protective system was like an attempt to keep running water from its natural course and level. The dam was for ever leaking, here a little and there a little; and at frequent intervals, when the 'protected' farmer in the vale below deemed most surely that his fortunes were 'a-ripening,' or whilst he possibly had gone to sleep in his false security, the dam gave way, and down came the deluge, bearing devastation and confusion with it.

Passing on to the natural or non-legislative causes, which are said, in the particular instance of the growth of grain, to make competition with the foreigner hopeless, we set aside, first, the better climate of the foreigner as an admitted though exaggerated fact: we put against it, however, certain natural or non-legislative advantages which the cultivators of the soil of Britain possess to a greater extent, not only than their grain-growing rivals, but than the inhabitants of any other country upon earth.

The British agriculturist has more abundant capital and cheaper than any of his rivals. The more we reflect upon this distinction, the higher value shall we put upon it. The increase of fertility which land derives from draining and manures is ascertained by this time: and equally so, that the land, which our agriculturists occupy, lies in the midst of the best market in the world — a piece of good fortune, which we shall presently illustrate. On the details of this part of the question we do not enter, partly because both the existence of the advantage, and the partial and singularly *unequal* degree to which it has been employed, are matters of admission among all persons of ordinary candour and intelligence, at all acquainted with the subject.

Another particular highly favourable to the British occupier, in which he has a century's start even of the rivals who come nearest him, is the comparative cheapness, frequency, and security of *transit* — a superiority which we always enjoyed to a vast extent in right of our insular position, and which is now immensely augmented by our railroads. If, in order to illustrate the money value of a railroad to a farmer, we take what may be called an average case, and suppose an arable farm of 350 acres to be situated within three or six miles of a station, and to be connected with a great market by twenty miles of rail, we shall find the annual saving on the carriage of the ordinary produc-

tions of the farm to be at least 60%.\* Mr. Smith, of Deanston, reckons the saving at two-thirds of the whole annual cost of transport; which, in the instance we have taken, would give a saving three or four times greater than the sum mentioned: but here, as throughout, we have been desirous to keep on the moderate or safe side. The large element which carriage of all kinds must form in the cost of products, so bulky as those in which the agriculturist deals, is undeniable. We observe that a petition was lately presented to Parliament from some farmers in Ross-shire, complaining of their distance from the London market—a complaint which, from its very absurdity, only indicates so much the more strikingly the importance belonging to the cost of transport. Now what is the position of our rivals with regard to the cost of transport? Measuring the distance of their farms from their sea-ports or markets (and speaking moderately), they have to travel a league of vile roads,—for every mile, of those excellent roads and railways, which even the worst-placed and most inland tenantry of Great Britain is sure of finding almost at their doors. The effect of facilities of transport is seen in the vast disparity, even among our most advanced neighbours, between the prices of produce of the same quality according as it is sold in different districts. M. Passy, in a ‘memoir’ read before the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, in 1844, mentions (and the statement is of more value from having been made incidentally, and when dealing with another subject,) that wheat brings in the vicinity of Bordeaux 25 or 30 per cent. more than wheat of the same quality in Lorraine. Taking a later date, we find, from the official returns for 1849, that in that year the average of the highest of the eight districts into which France is divided for corn-law returns was 25 per cent. above the average of the lowest. Speaking generally, those countries, from which we may really look for exports, are much worse placed than France, as regards internal communication; the rivers being frozen over for months, and the roads, when not altogether blocked up,

---

\* This by no means represents the whole advantage. The railway effects a saving also in the conveyance of manure; and often finds the farmer a market which would be otherwise inaccessible for root-crops, such as potatoes and turnips. For instance, we may mention that the great consuming district of Glasgow has, for the last two or three years, been largely supplied with potatoes carried by rail from East Lothian, on the other side of the island; and that preparations are making this season, in the county we have just named—the leading agricultural county of Scotland—for the growth of that root on a scale at least four times greater than was ever known before the potato-rot was heard of.

what would be here considered execrable. For instance; through the Trade Circulars of the corn merchants during spring, we find such advices as these—(*Circular of Messrs. Berry, Henderson, & Co., Leith*, giving extracts from the letters of their correspondents to this effect)—‘Dantzic, 10th Feb. From the wretched state of ‘the roads since the thaw commenced, our ‘supplies are short.’—‘Kœnigsberg, Feb. 9th. The bad roads ‘prevent supplies.’ While these are the complaints from ports like Dantzic and Kœnigsberg, situated on rivers, and in the most populous and prosperous of the grain-exporting countries, we may infer to what a degree the state of their roads must be a burden and impediment, in the case of other countries much more remote and backward; keeping in view throughout, that we are not now speaking of roads of such length as suggest themselves to our insular experience, but of hundreds of miles. Taking these facts into consideration, and remembering that after the foreign grower has reached his *own* port, an addition of about 35 per cent. (see the figures given on pp. 569, 570.) has to be made to its value there before it reaches *ours*, what other conclusion can we come to; even as regards grain, than this—that these natural advantages amount to a *natural* protection much greater than can be thought necessary to make up for any natural disadvantages which the British agriculturist can allege, or at least can prove? and one which none of our other producers, dealing as they do in articles of the cost of which carriage forms an almost inappreciable proportion, can possibly possess?

The greatest advantage, however, possessed by the home-grower, and an advantage of which none but a suicidal policy can deprive him, is, that he lives in the largest and dearest market in the world, and has, in his own countrymen, the only considerable community we know of, whose consumption largely exceeds its home production. The case of France during the past year proves this advantage to be infinitely greater than any artificial law could create; and when it is considered that France comes nearest us in the adequacy of her own demand to her own supply, and that she is under the shelter of a sliding-scale, it will be admitted that we have not chosen our instance unfairly. The average price of wheat in the French markets for the ten years ending 1847 was 51s. 2d., and during the same period her exports were more than balanced by her imports. In 1849, however, came an abundant harvest; and, without a single quarter being imported, the annual average went down to 33s. 9d.; and at the close of the year, even in the highest districts, was only 29s. 6d. Now, why was it that in a country within sight of our own shores, defended by rigid protection,

and not having imported a single quarter, prices fell last year 50 per cent. below its own ten years' average, and 30 per cent. below the year's price in this country, where there was an abundant harvest, open ports, and importations unprecedentedly and (for reasons we have seen) unnaturally large? Mainly, because the French agriculturist has a market only able to take off his average produce; while the British agriculturist has a demand almost always beyond his unaided powers of supply — a demand which has this year absorbed 13,000,000 quarters of foreign grain, and has yet maintained prices 30 per cent. above those of our nearest neighbour, notwithstanding that that neighbour has enjoyed Protection, had no imports, and has had a free access to our markets. Surely it is the height of unreasonableness for our agricultural complainers, not only to refuse to allow weight to facts like these, but never to speak of such a market except in depreciatory language, nor of the great body of consumers of which it consists, except as persons whose interests are socially and politically of no account.

It is quite possible, however, to lay too much burden even on such an ally as the largest demand and highest markets represent. The agriculturists used to be fond of telling the manufacturers that they, the agriculturists (a word they erroneously use as synonymous with the home market) are the manufacturers' *best* customers; they should remember, on the other hand, that the manufacturers are their *only* customers, or nearly so. For forty years our agricultural population has not increased at all, while agricultural produce has increased immensely, — the surplus being taken off only through the increased wealth and number of the other classes. Now, the whole history of the Corn-laws, from 1815 to 1849, shows that an artificially high price of food rapidly injures these other classes, and, by violently diminishing the consumption, speedily reacts on the grain-growers themselves; while, on the contrary, low or moderate prices raise the consumption with a celerity and to an extent of which we have never yet even *sighted* the limits. The experience of last year throws a striking light on this latter point. Every year since 1830 (and we might go farther back, bringing out the same results), we have imported more foreign grain than we consumed. In 1848, for instance, 2,580,959 quarters of wheat were imported; but, although for three months of the year, even the 1s. duty was suspended, only 1,865,294 quarters were passed for consumption. However, when we come to 1849, 3,872,134 quarters were, we find, imported, and 4,509,626 consumed. Taking this along with the fact that we had had an abundant home harvest and have now low stack-yards and warehouses, we get a glimpse of the extent to which

consumption is extended by low prices, and restricted by high. Under last year's prices it is obvious multitudes must have eaten bread who could not eat it before; and multitudes have had enough who formerly had too little. A law re-enacting high prices would just be, a law to pluck the bread out of these people's mouths. To say nothing of humanity, it is worse than doubtful if such a policy would be even profitable. No man can permanently profit by the injury of his customers; and in this case the grower of grain is apt to do more than simply *lose* customers. Dear food and bad trade (experience and reason show the two things to be inseparable) reduce the means and number of consumers; but they do more. Agriculture not being able to provide for the natural increase of the population, a certain number of persons must every year find a livelihood in other employments, or must go elsewhere; and, during the last three years of bad trade, emigration took off a number nearly equal to the whole natural increase. Now, where have they gone, and what are they doing? They are on the banks of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, growing corn. Whatever changes unfavourably the proportion between our population and our means of employing them, must tend to change them from customers into rivals, — from corn-consumers in Britain to corn-growers in countries to which British ports are open. Turn it which way you will, the more it becomes plain that it is the British agriculturist's interest to be content with his natural advantages, and that every attempt to grasp at more is throwing away the substance for the sake of a very shadow.

Besides the natural disadvantage of climate, our farmers, however, are instructed to prefer frequent allegations of other disadvantages under which they are told that they are suffering, to the same effect. They say that *labour* is cheaper with their rivals than with themselves. To this we return a direct denial, — if what is meant is, not nominal wages, but their proportion to the work done. It would not be difficult to demonstrate, by authentic and incontrovertible details, that, for a long period, the wages of the English agricultural labourer have been barely sufficient to procure him the food and raiment, upon which the amount of labour rendered by him could be actually performed. At its very best, what is spoken of as the raised scale of English necessities and comforts, comes to little more than that. Avoiding, however, painful and invidious particulars, we point to one general fact, which must, of itself, go a long way to refute these allegations about the dearness of British labour compared with foreign. If the English agricultural labourer were really and to any considerable extent a dearer article than the same class in other countries, we should

observe some tendency to bring in the cheaper article, every kind of natural obstacle notwithstanding. Now, the tendency is all the *other* way. Adam Smith, it is true, has told us that, 'after 'all that has been said of the levity of human nature, a man is, 'of all sorts of luggage, the most difficult to be transported.' But since Adam Smith wrote, everything relating to the transporting of men (except as regards language,) has undergone a revolution, of which he never dreamt: not much more money and time now serve to take a man to New Orleans and Constantinople than would have taken Adam Smith from Edinburgh to London. We see the effects of the change in actual facts, bearing on this question of free-trade in labour. We import no labour, but we annually *export* an immense quantity;—and to where? Principally to America, three thousand miles away, and the very country—which, though wages, and especially agricultural wages, are three times higher there than here, our Protectionists fear as one of their chief rivals in the British corn-market. As regards also the Continent, we *export* both skilled and unskilled labour, and import none. Diversity of language even is no impediment. This is established by well-known facts—from the evidence taken before Parliamentary Committees thirty years ago, down to the latest experience derived from the rebuilding of Hamburgh, or from railway-making at Boulogne, or flax-spinning at Lille. We are satisfied, that the disadvantage to which employers of English labour are exposed in consequence of the higher wages of their labourers is infinitesimally small. When the workman gets more money, it is only because he does more and better work. English wages may be very high: while English labour is very cheap. The Celt is at our door, ill enough off. Several circumstances go towards determining the quantity and species of Irish labour which come into competition with English labour in the English labour-market. Of these causes, nobody can assign to each its true proportion; and say how much Irish labour stays away on account of its real dearth notwithstanding its apparent cheapness—and how much is kept out through the hostile operation of English Poor-laws.

Upon the other two alleged agricultural disadvantages—*taxes* and *rent*—it is not requisite to enter. The former,—as regards at least the general amount and pressure of English taxation, compared with foreign,—is the subject of a separate paper; the latter is a matter of private business, and not of public policy. Without interfering with the question,—whether a reduction of rents at this juncture is necessary and just; we maintain that prices must regulate rent, not rent prices; and we only add that it would be a matter of regret and reproach, if any loss caused by the new



system should be allowed by the landlord to fall on tenants, who never benefited by the old.

Perhaps the strongest dissuasive from Protectionist agitation remains yet to be mentioned. Success, or, at least, permanent success, is impossible; and there is immense mischief and risk in the attempt. Never did any set of men 'go to the country'—not even our High Church clergy in the Sacheverell movement, which they seem to be preparing—with a cause more essentially unpopular, or under circumstances more utterly adverse. A tax on bread, and that tax for the benefit, not of the State, but of a class, is at any time an ugly proposal, and is especially desperate at a time like this. In State affairs, it is always more easy for those in possession to defend than to restore; while in this case all the powers that proved themselves powerful enough in the first instance to destroy, remain prepared to resist restoration, and have been multitudinously recruited. The League, though long triumphant among the more intelligent and active sections of the middle class, never really roused nor even thoroughly conciliated the masses. The leaders of the League appeared to think that they had made a great advance, when their public meetings were no longer in danger of being swamped by crowds of Chartists; who, if not subsidised by Protectionist money, were inflamed by the Protectionist fallacy that cheap bread must mean low wages. But all this is changed. That which no reasoning, however forcible, and no eloquence, however unadorned, enabled them to perceive, is now made palpable and visible. Like blind Kent, they 'see it feelingly.' They can now understand it even in Buckinghamshire.\* Among the manifestations, all too rude, at most of the Protectionist meetings during the winter, may be detected, even in the most rural districts, a slight foretaste of what would be the characteristics of Protectionist agitation, should it be carried into or near the enemy's country,—that is, into any of the great seats of population; or should the enemy, that is, the great body of consumers, be incited to reprisals by any considerable measure or even appearance of success on the part of their agricultural aggressors. 'In this question,' said Lord John Russell, in that speech on the Address which in breadth of view and quiet force

---

\* 'We did not find that any hope was entertained of a return to 'Protection; indeed, one respectable farmer told us that the labouring 'classes were now so well educated and read so many tracts and news- 'papers, that they would rise in a body to prevent it. This statement 'was made by a man in every way opposed to Free-trade principles, 'and was accompanied with expressions of regret at the "evil effects of ' "knowledge upon the poor."—*Times' Agricultural Commissioners, High Wycombe, Jan. 24.*

has seldom been excelled by him,—‘in this question every man has a stake, every man, woman, and child has and feels an interest. If you were to put on a duty raising the price, every man would count the additional 1s., 1s. 6d., or 2s. a week, which you would have made him pay for the support of his family. Now, are you ready to face that question?’ It would be facing a powder-magazine with a torch.

And yet there are, or were a few weeks ago, some of those who have most to lose and most to fear, who seemed, nevertheless, disposed to enter on the enterprise. We shall not soon forget the startling recklessness of spirit and coarseness of speech, with which certain even of the magnates of the land set out, some five months back, on this desperate crusade. Never did poor Chartist demagogue, besotted with ignorance and the fumes of mob applause,—and perhaps ‘speaking in hunger for bread, not in thirst for revenge,’—vapour either more foolishly or more fiercely than sundry Protectionist leaders, from Dukes downwards. It is an evil thing when Peers talk glibly of ‘revolution’ as something likely, if not justifiable; and when county members denounce the chief statesmen of the country as ‘liars,’ amid applauding yells and oaths. And under what motive and cue for passion do these nobles and senators thus

‘Drown the stage with tears,—  
And cleave the general ear with horrid speech’?

It is in a breeches’ pocket cause,—a question between their pockets and the pockets of the rest of the community. They talk of ‘revolution,’ and do their utmost, by fair means and foul, to get up an agitation,—in order to escape from the grievance of cheap bread! What! after Great Britain—‘serene, like heaven above the clouds’—has preserved throughout the revolutionary storm which has been recently sweeping over Europe, an attitude and aspect which will form one of the noblest features in her noble history,—after having remained unshaken, unseduced, unterrified, amid the war of principles and the crash of thrones,—is she to be cast into danger and confusion from motives mean as these, and for objects so unreasonable and hopeless? And worse, after our industrious masses stood patient through the semi-famine of 1847, and loyal through the revolutionary fever of 1848, are our aristocracy to exhibit themselves in the character of wanton disturbers of the public peace, whenever their commodity, the poor man’s loaf, is not so dear as scarcity and monopoly might make it? Such a course would not be grateful, nor decent, nor prudent; and is as alien, we believe, to the instincts of English gentlemen, as, we are sure, it is to their interests.

- ART. X. — 1. *Rückblick auf die Entwicklung der Deutschen Angelegenheiten im Jahre 1849.* (Retrospect of the development of German Affairs in the year 1849.) Berlin : 1850.
2. *Preussen und seine politische Stellung zu Deutschland und den Europäischen Staaten von Bülow-Cummerow.* (Prussia and her Political Relation to Germany and the States of Europe.) Berlin : 1849.
3. *An Heinrich Gagern ; eine Stimme aus dem Deutschen Volke.* (To Henry Gagern ; a Voice from the German People.) Stuttgart : 1849.
4. *Political Letters on Germany.* By GERMANICUS. (In the 'Globe' Newspaper.)

WE closed our remarks on the Political State of Germany, twelve months ago, at the moment when the Headship of the German Union had been offered to the King of Prussia by the Parliament of Frankfurt, and while his answer was still uncertain. It was a moment in which much of the future of the civilised world hung upon the will of one man. A spontaneous and informal meeting of representatives of public opinion had drawn from the Germanic Diet the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, whose legality was undisputed, and whose decisions only wanted to be acted on to become laws. The arch of the constitution had been gradually raised, and the key-stone lay ready to consolidate the work. After apparent hesitation, and with semblances of regret, the King of Prussia declined the honour and the responsibility, and in so doing sealed the doom of the German Parliament. Disheartened and, for the time, distracted, the Constitutional Party, who had struggled long and well against fanaticism and treachery, almost disappeared from the scene : the last days of the Assembly were characterised by impotent violence, and its extinction was almost more welcome to the friends of its promise and its purpose, than to the enemies who rejoiced over its downfall.

We have sometimes thought that the magnitude of this enterprise of a German Empire has not been sufficiently understood in this country to be justly appreciated ; and the contemplation of what it was the King of Prussia by that act rejected, may both surprise and instruct. It was the revival in himself and his House of the great traditionary organisation of that sacred Roman Empire, which fills the central period of European history : it would have placed within the control, not indeed of his arbitrary will, but of his counsel, his judgment, his administrative skill, and all the moral influences from which a sagacious constitutional monarch

can distil so much real power, the political destiny of thirty-three millions of men, more generally educated, and less exposed to violent popular instincts, than any other civilised people : he might have wielded, for the defence of the nation and for the assertion of its rights and dignity against other powers, a force of not less than half a million of highly-disciplined soldiers ; and through him a distinct and authoritative foreign policy would have impressed on the history of Europe the desire and opinions of the German people, instead of the nullity of the diplomatic equilibrium, which may represent, indeed, contending principles, but which expresses only rival interests.

But the acceptance of such a trust, though in itself an act of courage, does not imply the power or the means of conducting it to any good issue. There are two other grave points of consideration,—the obstacles which stood in the way of success, and the capacity of the man to surmount them. We have never concealed from ourselves or others the gravity of these impediments. However earnest and truthful the yearning of a large majority of the people of the several German States towards a comprehensive unity,—a feeling based on a supposed historical reality, and severely tested by persecution and by time,—yet it was evident that the ready consent of the governments of the smaller States, and the tardy or prospective adhesion of the larger, had little foundation either in their national sentiment, personal conviction, or high policy, and could only be the result in some cases of individual timidity, and in others of absolute despair. Many, and indeed most, of the grand-duchies and principalities had found the independence conferred on them by the Treaty of Vienna an intolerable burden : the evils of political convulsion and discontent were infinitely aggravated by the smallness of the locality : the public force was not sufficient to afford protection to life and property against the tumults of the hour ; and royal dignity had not those means of preserving itself from insult, which the lowest delegated authority enjoys in a large and well-organised community. But in the case of the four Kingdoms, it was very different. As long as the army remained faithful, there was no particular personal danger ; and it was clear that nothing short of an exercise of revolutionary power on the part of the people, or the pressing fear of it, could force the Governments into a scheme, with the grandeur of which they had no sympathy, and the immediate effect of which, in the elevation of Prussia, was eminently unwelcome to them. Hanover, with her old grudges and still mindful of the thwarted ambition of her neighbour, — Saxony, with her sense of inconvenient contiguity, and the recollection of 1815, when her very

existence was in peril,—and Würtemberg, with her avowedly Austrian and Russian predilections, were none of them likely to submit to anything but necessity; while Bavaria, proud of her historical and often anti-German past, and regarding herself as distinct from the North of Germany both in religious sentiments and in some material interests, was evidently determined to struggle hard, before she permitted her political individuality—now idealised to her imagination by her great sculptor Schwanthaler—to be subordinately grouped into a German Hegemony. The hostility of Austria to the project was sure to be that of a defeated rival: her unhappy relations with her own provinces could not, indeed, at that time have allowed of open hostilities, but no resources of diplomacy and intrigue would be spared, to mar the fortunes of the new-born Union, and present menaces might easily be fanned into future war. Of the opposing influences of foreign Powers we speak with caution, because they are each so modified by the internal condition of their several countries at any particular moment, that it is difficult to estimate the worth and weight of the opposition. But it has ever been the traditional policy of France to prevent the cohesion and compactness of Germany\*; and the establishment of this mighty Union, emanating from the popular will, constraining the inclinations of dynasties, and accepting all the principles of constitutional government, must have combined every element most distasteful to the Czar, and most likely to provoke his interference in the centre of Europe.

On the other hand, there is perhaps no undertaking of equal importance in history against which equal obstacles have not been brought to bear, but which men have not been found equal to surmount. The fable of Napoleon Bonaparte, as recorded by Archbishop Whately, rests on the unlikelihood of his success: for the heroic is ever supernatural, as far as ordinary life is nature, and our adult and accomplished world is just as susceptible of fantastic events and dramatic surprises as that distant past which imagination adorns and obscures. Will not the February of 1848 seem to future historians a moment of time as astonishing in the magnitude and diversity of its accidents, and as important in its results, as perhaps any other recorded on the dial-plate of

---

\* We have heard a distinguished French statesman very lately assert, 'that he should think even the possession of the Rhenish Provinces of Prussia a poor compensation to France for the dangers of a German Union.' There was more of this feeling in the moderation that prevented the French army in 1848 from establishing the kingdom of Northern Italy than liberal statesmen are willing to own.

the world? That hour assuredly was not unpropitious to great and new events; and the moral impulse from which the movement sprang had already done so much, that probability was no limit to its power. If in 1847 it had been predicted to the German governments that in the following spring the hitherto obstructive and absolutist Diet would unanimously decree, and all its members, including Austria, would issue orders for, the election of the National Assembly of Germany,—in which the power should be vested to give a Constitution (*die verfassunggebende National-Versammlung*); and that the Diet would solemnly surrender all its rights into the hands of a central power responsible to this Assembly, what language could have characterised the extravagance of the supposition? And yet this came about from two simple causes,—the intense desire of the German people for a national unity, and the involuntary confession of the separate governments, in the crisis of revolution, that there did lie in that union an ultimate defence, both of the social order, at that time seriously threatened, and of the very authorities themselves, at that time so gravely endangered.

When, indeed, the immediate peril was past, the international difficulties revived; and the unanimity of feeling, which had brought the Assembly together, was shattered by opposing interests and dynastic jealousies. The position of Prussia soon clearly defined itself. In March, 1848, M. Von Gagern had proposed to the Legislative Chamber of Hesse-Darmstadt that, until some complete change should be effected in the constitution of Germany, one German sovereign should be invited to take the direction of the affairs of the Confederation; and he strongly indicated the King of Prussia, as the only one whose political tendencies and material circumstances permitted him to be selected. The meeting of fifty constitutionalists, which took place at Heidelberg in the same month, under the superintendence of Gervinus and Bassermann, and which convoked the Vor-Parlament, made no concealment of its intention of proclaiming the King of Prussia head of the new *Bund*. But the revolution of March at Berlin considerably changed this aspect of things. The popular opinion which had looked on the King of Prussia as the necessary 'Deliverer,' now finding him in open battle with a portion of his people, and amenable to the same accusations as other sovereigns, turned bitterly against him. His tardy concessions to the popular will were, then at least, believed to have been extorted by necessity, and no credit was given to him for them. On the other hand, the ready acceptance of the convocation of the Frankfurt Parliament by Austria, had layed for the moment its own revolutionary spirit, and had been fol-

lowed by the nomination of the Archduke John; so that the position of the Austrian party in the Assembly was very different from that which the statesmen of Western Germany could have anticipated. No one could have believed that Austria would have succeeded in making any head against the tide of liberal opinions or against the long-nourished and carefully inculcated doctrine, that the unity of Germany had been the passionate dream of the youth of Frederick William and was now the main project of his experienced manhood.

It had, however, required a protracted and consistent course of anti-German policy on the part of Prince Metternich to dissociate the ideas of German Unity and Austrian Headship in the German mind. When the proclamation of Kalisch, in 1813, had raised the standard of German nationality, and summoned to the field those popular hosts, who reinstated the power which the armies of Frederick the Great had been unable to preserve and would have been unable to restore, no thought of Prussian supremacy existed in the mind of any man. When, again, the princes had betrayed the hopes of the people, and Germany, dismembered and 'leas'd-out,'\* found herself nearly as powerless for either her own developement or her influence on the world as while she lay bound beneath the eagles of France, the forbidden dream of German empire was surmounted with the figure of Barbarossa, and the descendants of the House of Hapsburg were looked on as equally recreant to their own uncontested rights and their inherited duties to the common fatherland. The policy under which Austria rejected and persecuted this feeling, instead of making use of it, was certainly not founded on any chivalrous disinterestedness; but was a necessary consequence of a principle, the wisdom of which late events have rather confirmed than disproved, — namely, that the unitary government of Austria is only possible under an absolute sovereign. So strong was this conviction in the minds of the Emperor Francis and his minister, that, on the reconstruction of Europe, Belgium was given up without an effort; and Lombardy and Venice (which it is now a high political heresy to conceive of as disconnected from Austria) were accepted with reluctance, the Emperor having at the first pledged his word to the British commissioner that he would not resume them. The apparent sacrifice was reasonable and

---

\* This dear, dear land,  
Dear for her reputation through the world,  
Is now leas'd out (I die pronouncing it)  
Like to a tenement or pelting farm.

*Richard II., Act 2d Sc. 1st.*

far-sighted. For the non-German population of Austria would in any case so far outnumber the German, that, under a common constitutional system, the German element would necessarily be overpowered; while, on the other hand, it was very problematical whether provinces so entirely alien as these in habits, language, and position, could be retained in faithful and profitable connexion under an irresponsible central rule. When it had been once assumed that the federative principle should not be applied to Austria, but that, on the contrary, all the efforts of the government were to be bent towards obliterating provincial distinctions, it was wise to make the Empire as compact as possible: And, though the Lombard soldier is now playing *mora* on the frontiers of Saxony, this military triumph has been achieved by a waste of resources and of vigour which deprives the victory of present profit or future peace. As long, therefore, as the Austrian Government was determined rigorously to pursue the system of an absolute and centralised authority, it was impossible for it to take advantage of the great national feeling, which only saw in Austria the traditionary Head of the German Federation, administering its affairs in strict adherence to laws and customs, and honouring the liberties of the other States as its own. It was not so much an opportunity that had been lost by Austria, as that circumstances had arisen entirely incompatible with the form of national existence, which she had advisedly adopted and constantly adhered to. When, after the lapse of years, the influences of Austria and Prussia met face to face at Frankfurt, the chief author and agent of this system was himself in exile. On that occasion, Austrian statesmen would have done well to remember that, while, on the one hand, they could not reasonably have attempted to divest themselves of complicity with the former system, and to claim as their own the interests they had for thirty years been trampling under foot; on the other hand, it had now become equally extravagant to hope to realise what their ablest minister had never attempted in his plenary authority, — a unitary Austria, exercising empire over Germany.

But the suspension, or even the extinction, of the claims of Austria to the headship, did not necessarily imply their assumption by any other Power. Confederation (*Staaten-bund*) and union (*Bundes-staat*) still remained two possible and distinct schemes of reconstruction. For all her own immediate purposes Austria had always found the old Diet sufficiently subservient, from Prussia down to Lichtenstein. But the restoration of the Diet implied the destruction of all that the Frankfurt Assembly represented: the very existence of that body had been an abso-



lute proof that the Diet had failed of its object and end: the constitution they were there met to frame was of necessity to be something in principle and action other than the Diet; and hence the representatives of Austrian interests, as opposed to German, became members of the Assembly for the purpose of destroying it, and framers of the constitution with the intent of making it null and void. Thus, when the parliamentary history of Frankfurt comes to be written, it will be seen that no abnegation of political consistency was too great to accomplish this object. If the Union must be decreed and the Headship offered to Prussia, the main effort was to be directed to giving it such characteristics as would make it most unacceptable to the King. Universal suffrage, — unwelcome to all industrial interests, as well as contrary to the general German appreciation of political power as a trust; and the suspensive veto, — eminently offensive to a mind which even at the moment of concession loves to cheat itself with the imagination of its own unfettered will, — these and other democratic portions of the constitution, were carried by the votes of the Austrian members.

The essentially Conservative and Constitutional Party, of which Gagern is the head, was thus thwarted by the very persons, who, if not Austrians, would have been its natural supporters; and the democrats profited by the aid of these treacherous allies. The design was successful; and the Constitution offered to the King of Prussia gave a plausible pretext to those who described it as an ill-concealed Republic. Many of the princes who adhered to it made no secret of their belief, that it would seal their political doom; and the king was earnestly warned, even by those who were not absolutely disinclined to the undertaking, to beware lest he became the puppet of a merely destructive faction, who would use his name and that of Prussia to complete the disorganisation of society. Nor were there wanting accusations of treason to the order to which he providentially belonged. The cause of kings in such an hour, it was said, was the cause not of one, but of all; and the man of honour was appealed to, when the statesman hesitated.\* There are two springs of human action, before either of which all these and similar remonstrances might have given way; — intense personal ambition, or entire conviction of rightful duty. But neither of them was here. When the hour of action arrives, it is not enough that a man should have his theory of what he would wish to see accomplished; the Deed comes to him dressed in circumstances so different from what his fancy had depicted: it stands before him, long expected, yet hardly recognised: and the opportunity, on which days have meditated and nights have

dreamt, passes by unseized, and is lost for ever. Heroic ambition, unshaken and unscrupulous, working out its ends by evil or by good, and trusting to be absolved by the history itself has made, rejoices too heartily in the occasion of action to analyse what lies beyond. Patriotic or philanthropic devotion confronts the danger, comparatively careless of victory, in the self-sufficing consciousness of right; and is less the agent of its individual, will than of a certain divine necessity. By one of these impulses Frederick the Great raised up Prussia, by the other Washington created the United States; and either might have erected a United Germany. As it is, the '*gran rifiuto*' of modern times will long remain a subject for the conflict of probabilities; and be discussed as one of those events, which, if it had happened otherwise than it did, might have altered the history of Europe.

The King of Prussia, now acting under the counsel of General Radowitz, attempted to obtain by diplomatic means what he had rejected when presented by the popular will; and the events which occurred in rapid succession proved incontestably that there was no fear of a fierce and brutal demagoguery succeeding, even under the most favourable circumstances, to turn the national sentiments to their own ends. The Democratic Party believed that the moment was arrived when the people, hopeless of any good from above, and indignant at the abandonment of the great cause by their chosen chief in the crisis of its consummation, would rise in its wrath and sweep before it all established government, as it had done in France on much less provocation. Baden and Saxony burst into open revolution; in the former the extinguisher itself caught fire, and the army joined the rebels. Austria at the time was too busily occupied with her own embroilments to be capable of offering any material assistance, and no army but the Prussian seemed of sufficient force to arrest the movement. But the King of Prussia could not leave his own dominions unprotected; and it was only by calling out the Landwehr, that he was enabled to succour his distressed confederates. On this emergency, the king summoned his people to be the guardians of public order in Prussia, while he put down by force the outbreaks, which his own refusal of the Headship of Germany had provoked. This was much to ask; for it required the Prussian people to assume the attitude of repressing the excesses to which the irresolution of their sovereign had the appearance of having mainly contributed, and also to show him a mark of entire confidence at the very moment when he had disappointed their highest national hopes. And yet, almost without an exception, the service was faithfully discharged,—that service, which would

have been rendered with tenfold readiness, had it been demanded to maintain order and arrest confusion in United Germany. There is also little doubt, but that the ultra-democratic portions of the Frankfurt Constitution would have been constitutionally altered with great facility: or that the reaction against the extravagancies of democracy, which was certain to invade the minds of men, might have been prudently used to fence round the central authority with all such protection as was compatible with constitutional freedom. The governments which had received, and those who might desire to receive, the assistance of Prussia in their hour of need, were naturally expected to be prepared with some equivalent. The results of gratitude were now to be added to those of fear, and upon this groundwork the so-called League of the Three Kings, — of Prussia, Hanover, and Saxony, — was established. It was based on a constitution which embodied all that was really essential in that of Frankfurt: and the parties were bound to adhere to this engagement for the space of one year. If by that time no arrangement had been come to by the other German States, they were at liberty to reconsider the scheme. The King of Würtemberg, having been forced into submission to the Constitution of Frankfurt, did not think it worth while to adopt the Prussian modification; and Bavaria, after holding out hopes of an amicable agreement, grew more positive in her alienation, in proportion as Austria grew freer from actual embarrassment, and more able to afford her a direct support and countenance.

The intervention of Russia in the Hungarian war had now liberated Austria — not from any great national calamity, but — from the necessity of admitting the limited independence of that extensive kingdom. There was no period during that conflict, up to the actual intervention of foreign troops, when the young Emperor would not have been joyfully crowned at Pesth as King of Hungary; and it is doubtful whether that would have not been the result of Hungarian victory, even at the last moment. But, there are certain favours which no man can receive at the hands of another without some loss of self-esteem, and so it is with nations. Gloss it over as they may, the acceptance of this assistance has inflicted a most humiliating wound on Austrian dignity: and all the brave blood in which it has since been bathed cannot heal it. To have been the first German power to call in Russian troops to its assistance, was an odious characteristic in the judgment as well as instincts of all true Germans: and the pretensions of Prussia must now, accordingly, be doubly galling to the cabinet of Vienna, after so flagrant a demonstration of its own weakness. In the very cause of order, of which Austria

had been the persistent champion, Prussia was winning national laurels all her own, while Austria was receiving Cossack aid. The very provinces which Austria had of old wrapped round the German Empire, and stood between Germany and France, were now rescued from anarchy by Prussian troops; and Saxony was compelled by circumstances into that dependence on Prussia, which, from her local position, it must have been naturally one of her chief political objects to avoid.

About this time a meeting of the Conservative National Party took place at Gotha, at which it was resolved to adhere to the League of the Three Kings, distinguished by the title of 'the 26th of May.' By this act a certain sanction of public opinion was given to what otherwise might have been regarded as a simple demonstration of royal will, and liable to all the changes and chances of that condition. This engagement gradually received the accession of all the Powers who had been parties to the constitution of Frankfurt, with the exception of Hesse-Homburg (whose landgrave is an Austrian field-marshal,) and of Frankfurt, still the residence of the Austrian Archduke John. Plenipotentiaries of all these governments met at Berlin under the presidency of Prussia, for the purpose of preparing the drafts of the measures to be laid before the General Assembly, which it was now decided should be held at Erfurt. Military conventions were also entered into, which drew closer the relations between the forces of several of the States and those of Prussia. During these arrangements the liberation of Austria by Russian arms enabled the kings of Hanover and Saxony to show with how little sincerity or good-will they had joined the League at all, and it was only by more firmness than Prussia had often exhibited, that she succeeded in definitively fixing the convocation of the Assembly for the 20th of March, 1850.

If the extinction of all enthusiasm and of the power that accompanies the passionate impulses of multitudes delays almost indefinitely the solution of the German question, and complicates its difficulties by allowing authority to interests and designs which would otherwise have been swept away on the instant, it is an advantage to a foreign reviewer to be able now to state the case as one of facts, and to balance the plain reasonableness of the propositions before him. The long and weary negotiations between Berlin and Vienna have produced no fruit; neither the consent of Austria to a German Union, nor the contentment of Prussia with a simple Federation. The division of Germany into Circles which would submit each of the lesser States to one of their powerful neighbours, and thus absorb them into the several kingdoms, has been one basis of the Austrian proposals. This

plan would reconstruct Germany under six divisions; and was in no way unwelcome to the smaller sovereignties; for by these means a better chance of future importance was held out to them, than by any other political arrangement. But just in proportion as the power of these separate kingdoms was consolidated, would the subdivision of Germany be confirmed; and, whatever other advantages might result from it, the scheme supposed an entire abandonment of all notion of a United Germany. A circular from Prince Wittgenstein to his diplomatic agents, dated July 21. 1849, sketches out a simpler form of partition; viz., an Austrian Germany south of the Main, and a Prussian Germany to the north. This is a scheme which could only be realised by sheer material force; and which has neither historical basis, nor public opinion, nor State necessity to stand on. Any such project is totally without a precedent, unless a precedent is accepted in the dismemberment of Poland, or in the secret treaty (of the 14th April, 1816) between Austria and Bavaria, in which the former power guarantees to the latter the reversion of the Baden Palatinate, in case of the extinction of the direct male line of the existing Grand Duke. By this treaty Austria is exhibited disposing of territories, over which she had not the slightest pretence of right; thus evincing the sincerity of the regard so loudly expressed by her for the independence of lesser Powers,—the appearance of which at least was preserved in the old Diet by the parity of votes given to the smaller and greater States. But a new device has been lately started, and at the present moment is attracting the attention, more perhaps than the confidence, of the public. The former Austrian proposals had altogether rejected the principle of popular representation; a course which it should seem is no longer regarded politic. There shall therefore be an Assembly, consisting of about 300 members,—one third elected by the Legislative Assemblies of Prussia, one third by those of Austria (including all her non-Germanic States), and one third by those of the rest of Germany. Above this must be placed a Directory of Royal Commissioners, one named by the Emperor and each of the six Kings, and one by the two Hesses (Darmstadt and Cassel). The other States can appoint one of these seven its representative in the Directory, except where especial engagements of agnation and rights of succession connect it with some especial Power—a stipulation evidently introduced to prevent the general surrender of themselves by the smaller States into the hands of Prussia. It is with the same object that the two Hesses are preferred to Baden as the seventh Director, in order to cut off Baden from Prussian influence, and thus force her into submis-

sion to Bavaria. To this scheme the three kings of Würtemberg, Bavaria, and Saxony have formally acceded, the latter at the imminent risk of a collision with his parliament. Hanover, as yet, abstains, both on public and private grounds. Her local isolation prevents her from joining a league from which she could derive no material advantage; and there are men among her ministers who anticipate that the flagrant false pretensions and extravagance of the scheme would, if it attained any substance, drive the whole public opinion of Germany to Erfurt as the only hope of refuge.\* For if such an Assembly were convened, it would contain some fifty or sixty deputies, not only not Germans, but in many cases, and in some justly, implacable enemies of the German name and power,—who, in a division of parties, might become the arbiters of German destinies. These fears, however, never will become alarming, from the universal conviction that the Assembly, as proposed, is a mere bait thrown out to catch the constitutionalists; and that its only serious intention is to arrest the congress of Erfurt. How indeed could the hundred Austrian members be elected by the Legislative Assembly of Austria, which is not yet in existence, while the Directory might be summoned at once and assume the whole faculty of administration? And when this authority had been once constituted, what reasonable man can believe that any portion of its power would be willingly abandoned to the chances of even such an imperfect representation?

Were it really possible to test the opinions of the intelligent and educated classes of Germany on this question of Unity as distinguished from the interests of princes, the theories of philosophers, and the schemes of statesmen, we should rejoice in the occasion. We are by no means minded to assume that the impulses which called together the Parliaments of Frankfurt still exist in the sober second-thought of the people; but we must own that, as yet, we have no proof to the contrary. There is, no doubt, a strong party who are repelled by the prominence which circumstances have given to Prussia in the practical working out of the idea, just as there is a large body of Prussian officials who have no notion of opening Prussian employments to the rest of Germany, and who raise the cry that Prussia must perish when Germany begins. Now it is clear that Prussia, having interpreted the 11th article of the Federal Act of 1815 into the right of all and any

---

\* See a dispatch of M. Detmold, Hanoverian Plenipotentiary at Frankfurt (dated Feb. 14.), which has found its way into the Cologne Gazette of March 21.

German States to form among themselves a league of any kind, — even, as in the case of the Hohenzollern Principalities, to merge themselves in any other State, — she cannot contest with Austria or Bavaria the right of forming with the kings or other princes such a confederation as they may think fit. These are the privileges of the dynasties; — beyond and above these rest the rights and the will of the people. No portion of Germany, except Austria, is now without its legal organ; the press is free; public meetings on this topic could hardly be dispersed by force, if conducted with order; and we own that we should see our way much more clearly by these lights than by any array of diplomatic notes, of projects written to be rejected, and counter-projects rejected before proposed.

Germans must not be surprised that England, whose commercial interests are so intimately bound up with the peace of Europe, should look with suspicion on any political change, which may compromise the friendly relations of the great Continental Powers. It requires both knowledge and foresight to understand the evils which threaten the peace of Europe from the old constitution of Germany; but it requires neither the one nor the other, to feel that the irritation of Austria and the wrath of Russia are elements of future distress to all other European nations. On the other hand, in case the rivalry between Prussia and Austria could be turned into any fair and liberal alliance, this would, in itself, be a guarantee for peace; and any organisation of Germany, founded sincerely on such a basis, not dynastically but nationally, might well defy the violence of all Foreign Powers. If, therefore, the Austrian scheme were practicable, its advantages are undeniable; and nothing but a consideration of its material and moral obstacles has inclined us against it. Some of these we have already alluded to: the immense disproportion of the German and non-German populations; the non-German and, frequently, anti-German sympathies of whole races of Austrian subjects; the pride and power of the Slavonians, who make no concealment of their hatred and contempt for Germany, which they look upon as crumbling into senile impotence, while the future of Europe rests with their youthful energies: how can these and any principles the like of these possibly become constituents of a German Unity? Again can Germany, or ought she, to be made responsible for all the complications of foreign relations, to which the diverse and distracted portions of Austria expose the Austrian government, — for instance, to a war with Piedmont or France for Lombardy, with Russia for Galicia or Transylvania? Nor would the strength which Austria

might acquire by the German Union be of a nature to secure her from those acts of cruel and treacherous weakness which have disgraced her administration, and are still dishonouring it. The permissive massacres of Galicia or the proscriptions of conquered Hungary may be repeated any day, as long as no higher moral principle than the success of the hour shall guide the counsels of Vienna. Providence wonderfully adapts the moral strength of governments to the elevation of their moral standard; and self-defence is a poor excuse for evil deeds, when the weakness that makes it necessary is the consequence of ignoble motives or willing ignorance. And has the moral or the intellectual elevation of the Austrian government or people been such as to authorise her to assume and retain the direction of any large portion of the human race? A strict police gave to the sensuality of Vienna a sobriety — even a decency — which had the effect of organising vice to an extent almost unknown in any other capital. The absence of all proper excitement to the understanding or even imagination encouraged an animal life which debased but did not shock, and which, if completely successful, would have ended as much in limiting as in perverting the human faculties. But as weeds will grow up where seed is not sown, there was enough of prurient and rampant life to prevent this consummation. Good books were not read, but bad ones were eagerly devoured. There was a regular hierarchy of forbidden publications\*, and those absolutely interdicted had the largest circulation. While the North of Germany was rising into a higher existence, under the inspiration of poetry, history, and philosophy, there was nothing too corrupt or too dull for the Austrian market; and thus there is little wonder that the outbreaks in the Austrian cities have been characterised by a purposeless confusion, and have resulted in less political improvement than has been generally the case in the recent series of popular commotions. To replace Prince Metternich by Prince Schwarzenberg, and a patriarchal despotism by an indefinite state of siege, is as sad an issue of the efforts and sacrifices of political enthusiasm as its bitterest enemies could desire.

Germany requires moral guidance as well as national improvement; and if Austria cannot supply the one or the other, can Prussia? The negative proposition is doubtless much the easier to decide. In the encouragement of commerce, at least, Prussia has deserved well of Germany: she is the author of the Zollverein, the revision of which, at the end of 1853, she pro-

---

\* ‘*Damnatur*,’ ‘*Non Admittitur*,’ ‘*Transeat*,’ ‘*Erga Schedam*.’ In the last case the name of the purchaser was transmitted to the police.



poses shall be submitted to the German parliament. The scheme of German Unity must attach Hamburg to the Commercial League,—an object which would long ago have been obtained, in conjunction with another still more important, had not Baron Von Bulow broken off the negotiations, all but concluded, for the adhesion of Hanover. That State, not unreasonably, demanded some pecuniary satisfaction, by way of compensation to her people for the increase of price in many articles of common consumption, which would have followed from her junction with the Zollverein. The propositions were refused at the very moment when their acceptance seemed certain; and but for this accident, Prussia would have met the question of a German political Unity in 1848, with a commercial Unity already complete, Austria alone excepted,—an immense advantage as a starting-point. As it is, the power of exclusion from the Zollverein, on its revision, is a weapon of force in the hand of Prussia, and may be skilfully used, especially against Württemberg and Bavaria. The Austrian government feels the full advantage of commercial union with Germany, and many points are already in process of agreement with Prussia. But it does not seem likely that any terms will be arrived at, as concerns a common tariff; for Austria, although inclined to turn in the direction of free imports, can find no better way of conciliating the States of the Zollverein than by proposing that they should consent to a higher tariff, until such time as her national interests are sufficiently advanced for her to admit of a liberal one. Again, after much irresolution, and even semblance of bad faith on the part of the authorities, and after some immoderate acts on the part of the representatives of the people, the Prussian parliament is now firmly cast in a mould which promises endurance and developement; while, on the contrary, the paper-constitutions of Austria bear about them a singular unreality and disregard of circumstances—so very singular, that they look less like the theories of well-intentioned men, than deceptive measures artfully designed, should they be ever put in practice, to discourage free institutions by their failure, rather than encourage them by their success. From present appearances then, we think, it may fairly be concluded that the political influence of Prussian predominance would not, in the long run, be adverse to the constitutional liberties of Germany. Under a constitution so popular as that proposed at Erfurt, it is impossible that minor despotisms could revive; and the breadth of political views and the sense of the national dignity which must be created by the habits of a great assembly would go far to neutralise the petty

spirit of local politics, and infuse a higher feeling into the separate legislatures.

Although the accidental character of the present rulers of Prussia should justly have little to do with an enterprise, the success of which must depend on something far above and beyond the merits or conduct of individual men, yet it is in the power of those who hold authority in Prussia, at this moment, to check or advance the movement almost at will. Much will turn on the position assumed by her at Erfurt: if it is firm and independent,—relying on the affections of the people,—regardful of the rights of princes, less as individuals, than as representatives of their subjects,—tolerant of objections and criticism,—and rather contemplating the necessity with regret than boasting of the occasions in which her material force has been called on to defend the cause of order,—in that case, mere insolent menaces and coarse insinuations will not prevail against her work. But she must also be prepared to have the conduct of her government towards its own people taken as a test of her sincerity. If, for instance, the independence of Switzerland should be violated in the name of the feudal protectorate of the Prince of Neuchâtel, the weaker members of the League will naturally feel less confidence in entrusting themselves to Prussian power; if restraints upon the press, or limitation of trial by jury, take place at Berlin, the constitutionalists of Germany will be the less willing to attach themselves to a centre whose influence might be indirectly extended even to the modification of those fundamental rights which Frankfurt had established, and which it has bound itself to confirm. And as regards Foreign Powers, it is essentially incumbent on Prussia to give no colour whatever to the very natural imputation, that in all this project her first object is her own aggrandisement. This suspicion can only be set to rest by a resolute perseverance in declining every species of superiority not absolutely necessary for the service of the Union. Radowitz has begun well.

It is agreeable to many minds to represent in some personality an idea or scheme of action which they desire fully to apprehend. In that of German Unity the figure of Gagern offers itself in undisputed prominence. His father, acting as representative of the House of Nassau at the Congress of Vienna, distinguished himself through his desire to extend the sphere of the German Diet, by the admission of Luxemburg and Hölstein,—a plan, however, which would have weakened its influence, by dispersing it. His son joined the army in 1815, and passed into precocious manhood on the field of Waterloo, where the accidents of war placed him for a moment in a position of command.

Thence he returned to civil life, and at the University of Jena partook with enthusiasm of all the hopes and projects with which the youth of Germany hailed the new-born independence of their country. We know how these have since been thwarted and perverted; but with his sanguine temperament disappointment rather dimmed than darkened the future; and what was the zeal of the student is now the faith of the statesman. He soon after became distinguished in the service of the State of Hesse-Darmstadt, and retained office till he found his own opinions running so continually counter to those of his government, that he felt he had no alternative but to resign. After a short course of opposition, he resolved to retire from politics; and considerations of a private nature favoured his determination. He had been attached to a lady in the full enjoyment of health and beauty, and had looked forward to a proud and prosperous domestic life as ample compensation for the troubles and vexations of public duty. But a serious and probably fatal malady seized upon the object of his affections, and brought the daily prospect of death into the natural region of life and hope. The lady long combated his resolution to devote to her weakness and sorrow the vigour and bloom of his existence, but in vain. For nine years he tended her with undivided care, and he since has mourned her loss as deeply as if she had been to him all that their hopes had ever promised. Indeed, her great moral and intellectual qualities must have given to those years of apparent sacrifice a present happiness of the highest order; for, it was in that atmosphere of pure and tranquil affection that his mind was disciplined by study and experience to the stature it has now attained. Agriculture became his favourite pursuit; and his anxiety for the improvement of the cultivation of Germany led him to a minute consideration of her material interests. These he found to coincide in most points with that Union of the German States which had been the delight of his youth; so that, on his higher and inner life being broken up, he returned to public occupation, his imagination fortified by practical learning, and his feelings justified by his judgment. His political worth became apparent to the whole of Germany, as soon as it was perceived that his appointment to the government of his adopted country arrested the torrent of revolution in 1848; and all the public men of different States, who saw present safety and future welfare in German Unity, at once turned to him instinctively as their friend and guide. In the conduct of this question, steering between anarchy and despotism, he has shown himself worthy of this trust: his massive and towering figure and

his genial countenance inspire immediate confidence ; while a hearty optimism, which in the moment of personal failure seems to his colleagues to have a character of insensibility, bears him above all repulses, disappointments, and disasters. He meets the Assembly of Erfurt as resolutely as he met that of Frankfurt ; and if there were many men of his character engaged along with him, we should not hesitate as to the issue.

There can hardly be a greater contrast in history than the aspect of the circumstances under which these two Assemblies come together. If that of Frankfurt was borne so high on the wings of hope that its fall was inevitable, that of Erfurt has been in imminent danger of being crushed before it dares to rise. The one, however, looks as though it might be a beacon over the deep of time, the other was as the burning of a prairie. The folly of democratic violence has, for the moment, placed at the discretion of governments much more than it is desirable should be so placed ; and the essentially conservative and pacific character of the Erfurt project renders any appeal to popular excitement contradictory to the very terms of its existence. Will this one stable organisation rise above the confusions that still possess Europe, and demonstrate that there is no more instability in progress than in reaction ? For mere Order, even that of the divine Cosmos, is in itself a barren thing — as barren as mere Liberty : each requires the breath of life to generate what is good and great, — and it is only to their coincidence and harmony that we can look for any permanent advantage to the societies of mankind.

## INDEX.

*Agricultural distress*, complaints of, not new, 558—history of agricultural complaints, 559-62—what will be the effect of free trade on agricultural prices? 563-4—blindness of agricultural alarmists, 564-5—causes of the agricultural losses of last year, 566—what have been the causes, the amount, and the effect of the imports of last year? 567-76—advantages of the British agriculturist over his rivals, 576-79—effects of our agricultural policy, 580—allegation of our farmers that labour is cheaper abroad than at home, 580—other alleged disadvantages, 581—unpopularity of the protectionist movement, 582—late recklessness and coarseness of speech of its leaders, 583.

*Akenside's* 'Hymn to the Naiads,' notice of, 415.

## B

*Babylon*, Herodotus' description of the magnitude of, 145. See *Grote*.

*Barbary*, establishment of the piratical states of, 192-3. See *Turkey*.

## C

*Carlowitz*, peace of, 199.

*Charrière's*, S., 'Négociations de la France dans le Levant,' &c. 173.

*Colonization*, works relating to, 1—popularity of the topic of late, 1-2—political and moral evils of pauperism, 2-4—its effect on domestic relations, 5—its injurious effect on the patriotic sentiment, 6-7—wild schemes for meeting the evil, 8-9—creation of a class of peasant proprietors proposed as a remedial measure, 9—magnitude of the required remedies, 10-11—English pauperism compared with that of Scotland and Ireland, 12—extract from the Final Report of the Society of Friends relating to the corrupting influences of Irish destitution, 14—melancholy statement of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in confirmation of this fact, *ib.*—colonization proposed as the primary remedy, 14 *et seq.*—impossibility of the successful working of the Irish poor-law without emigration, 16—case of Ireland considered, 17 *et seq.*—flight of Irish capital, 23—its cause, *ib.*—economy of timely emigration, 23-4—industrial habits

of Irish emigrants, 25—whimsical objections against emigration, 26—advantages of colonization over all other remedies hitherto tried for Ireland, 27-8—Ireland's 'industrial resources,' 28-9—justice, humanity, and expediency of the State assisting emigration, 29—extract from Mill's 'Political Economy,' in support of this view, 30—who ought to contribute towards systematic emigration, 31—benefits resulting from colonization, 32-4—duty of the State to forward *collective* emigration, 35—a colonial life necessarily characterised by simplicity and contentment, 36—moral deficiencies proceeding from imperfect colonization, 37—mode of providing funds for emigration, 38-40—individual exertions not to be superseded by the State, 41—objection that emigration will swamp the colonial markets, 41-2—capacity of our colonies for the reception of emigrants, 43-6—the United States' 'War upon the Wilderness,' 47—summary of the suggestions of the witnesses before the Colonization Committee, 48—enlargement of our colonial labour markets, 49—facts connected with recent settlements in New Brunswick, 50-2—formation of new colonies, 53—our past errors to be retrieved in the colonies, 54-6—common interest of England and Ireland in colonization, 57—rooted aversion of many to emigration, 58-9—cost of colonization and cost of neglecting it, 59—what the active portion of the human race would have been but for emigration, 60—England peculiarly a colonizing power, 61-2. See *Ireland*.

*Constantinople*, capture of by the Turks, 181 *et seq.* See *Turkey*.  
*Currer Bell's* 'Shirley,' review of, 153 *et seq.* See *Shirley*.

## D

*Dolly's Brae*, 99. See *Orange Processions*.

## E

'*Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy*, delivered at the Royal 'Institution, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806. By the late Rev. 'Sydney Smith, M. A.,' 356. See *Smith*.  
*Emigration*. See *Colonization*.

## F

*Fitz-Stephen's* account of London in the reign of Henry II., 377. See *Water*.

## G

*Germany*, retrospective view of the late history of, 584—the German empire, *ib.*—the desire of the formation of the empire not a national sentiment, 585—the object insurmountable, 586—the constitutionalists, 587—proclamation of Kalisch, 588—the Diet and the Frankfurt Assembly, 589-90—proceedings of the Democratic party, 591—effect of Russian intervention in Hungary on the German mind, 592—the General Assembly at Erfurt, 593—plan of operations, 594—opinion on German unity, 595—view taken by England of the question, 596—moral requirements of Germany, 597-8—

sketch of the life of Baron Gagern, 599-600—contrast between the Assembly of Frankfurt and that of Erfurt, 601.

*Grote*, George, Esq., review of his 'History of Greece,' 118—historical sequences, 119-20—German historians, 121—treatment of early legends, 123—position and institutions of Sparta, 125-6—her successful military system, 127—history of the *réparvois*, 127-31—the Greek king, 131-2—authentic Athenian history, 132-3—Athenian gens, 133—Solon and his reforms, 134-7—his character, 137—the Pisistratidæ, 137-8—policy of Clisthenes, 139—his extension of qualification for office, 140—Greek slavery, 141-2—distinctions between Greeks and barbarians, 143—early relations of Greece and Asia, 144—wall of Babylon, 145-6—gigantic works of Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, 146-7—struggles between the Greeks and Persians, 148—Athens and her dependencies, 149—Greek physical science, 151-2—remarks on a few passages of ancient authors adverted to by Mr. Grote, 152 *note*.

## H

'*Hungarian Lady*, Memoirs of a,' by Theresa Pulszky, 496—M. Pulszky's summary of the history of Hungary, 503-4—Madame Pulszky's personal narrative, 505-6—absence of national character in Austria, 506-7.

## I

*Ireland*, its pauperism, 12—compared with that of England and Scotland, 12-13—extracts from the final report of the Society of Friends, and from the Lord Lieutenant's letter, relating to, 14—statement of the Poor Law Commissioners, *ib.*—an organised system of emigration the only effective step towards a remedy, 16—summary of facts elicited before the recent Committee of the House of Commons on the Irish Poor Law, 17—rural statistics, 17—break up of the social and agricultural system necessarily consequent on the failure of the potato, *ib.*—improvement of Irish agriculture, 18-20—under what circumstances is fresh capital likely to be invested in Ireland? and what the prospect for English investment? 20—exclusion of capital by over-population and lawlessness, 21—hopelessness of future dependence upon the potato crop, 22—emigration of small capitalists, 23—its cause, *ib.*—Mr. Hamilton's method of inducing small capitalists to remain at home, *ib.*—notice of arguments adduced for not assisting the already half-depopulated districts of Ireland, 24—Count Strzelecki's evidence of the success of Irishmen as emigrants, 25-6—inadequacy of all remedial measures hitherto attempted for Irish amelioration, 27—'industrial resources' of Ireland, 28-29—notice of Orange processions, and the disheartening results of party-spirit in Ireland, 87 *et seq.* \* See *Colonization, Orange Processions*.

*Ivan the Great*, notice of, 198.

## J

*Janizaries*, sketch of the rise and progress of the power of the, 180.  
See *Turkey*.

## K

*Keesar* of Roum, title of, when assumed by the Turkish chiefs, 182.  
*Knights Templars*, extinction of the order of, 176.

## L

*Lamartine's* 'Histoire de la Révolution de 1848,' review of, 228—value of the historical materials afforded by such an autobiography as the above, *ib.*—Lamartine's opinions as to the causes of the revolution, 229—national death or decomposition, what? 230-1—personal and organic revolutions, 232—Lamartine's account of the principles of the revolution of 1848, *ib.*—French place-hunting, 233—M. Dunoyer's remarks on the influence of place-hunting on the national character, *ib.*—Bonaparte, 234—M. de Tocqueville's prophecy of Jan. 27. 1848, 235—Louis Philippe's personal policy, *ib.*—the parties in opposition, and their grievances, 236-7—the actors in the revolution, 238-9—character of Lamartine as a historian, poet, and orator, 239-40—compared with Mirabeau and O'Connell, 240—Lamartine on the 24th February, 241—his progress in philosophy, 241-2—his grounds of action, 243—narrative of the revolution, 244-79—dissensions in the government, 280-2—Ledru Rollin's circulars, 283—Lamartine's account of their effect on the people, 283-4—demonstration of the 17th March, 285—Lamartine's intermediate policy, 286-8—intrigues of the factions in the government, 288-9—conduct of Ledru Rollin and Blanqui, 289-90—insurrection of the 16th of April, 290-1—election of the Assembly, 291—the new representatives, 291-2—Lamartine's embarrassments, 293—his reasons for refusing the presidency of the Republic, 293-4—his reasons for remaining in office, 295—character of his narrative, 296—Lamartine as an author, 297.

*Landor*, Walter Savage, review of his poetical works, 408—difference between ancient and modern poetry, 408-9—Greek poetry, 410—connexion between pantheism and polytheism, 411-2—the 'Hamadryad,' 413-4—imperfect appreciation of classic mythology, 415-16—'Acon and Rhodope,' 417—'Enallos and Cymodameia,' 417-18—'Corythos,' 419—the 'Madness of Orestes,' 420—Mr. Landor's dramas and dramatic scenes, 421—'Regeneration,' 422—his descriptive power, 423—Greek conception of love, 424—use and abuse of epithets, 425—'Gebir,' 425-6—its occasional obscurity, 427—'The Last of Ulysses,' 428—addiction to classic forms of composition, 429—exaggeration, 430—non-popularity of Mr. Landor's poetry, 430-1—beauty the main characteristic of Greek poetry, 432—Greek poetry and Greek arts, 433-4—Greek poetry and Greek philosophy, 435—Greek poetry and Greek morals, 436-8—moral deficiencies of recent poetry, 439—moral elevation of Greek poetry, 440-1—proper qualities of poetry, 442-3.

*Lees*, Sir Harcourt, 92. See *Orange Processions*.

*Lewis*, George Cornwall, Esq., review of his 'Essay on the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion,' 508—matters of fact and matters of opinion, 509-10—matter of perception and matter of inference, 511—definition of authority in matters of opinion, 512—concurrent testimony, 513-14—distinction between mock science



and true, 515-16—homœopathy and phrenology, 516-7—mesmerism, 517-8—Dr. Elliotson, 519—cases in the Mesmeric hospital, Calcutta, 520-1—force of authority in religious matters, 522-5—law and opinion on infidelity, 525-7—utility and proper province of authority, 527-36—persons competent to guide opinion on any subject, 536-8—authority of political bodies, 538-48—duty of the State in religious questions, 549-55—abuses of the principles of authority, 555-7—character of the work, 558.

## M

*Mill's* 'Political Economy,' extract from, in support of the view that it is the duty of the State to assist in emigration, 30. See *Colonization*.

*Mines*, British, notice of works relating to, 62—early attraction of their wealth, *ib.*—Britain's present subterraneous treasures, 63—M. Verlet's table of the comparative mining produce of Europe, *ib.* *note*—exaggerations as to the extent of our coal fields, 63-4—necessity of preserving records of mining operations, 65—compulsion of mining companies in Prussia to furnish government with exact plans, *ib.*, *note*—system in Austria, 66 *note*—indispensability of registration of plans of underworkings, 67—existing records inaccurate and not usually available, 68-9—calamitous results of the present condition of mining records, 69—accidents from the irruption of water, 70-2—importance of an authentic record of the facts and phenomena of explosions, 73—ruination and fraud from want of registration, 73-5—Statute of Limitations regarding mines, 75-7—lessors of mines frequently victims of lessees, 77—other grievances, 78—the 'old man' of our metallic mines, 79-80—risks attending the present system, 80-2—immense value of registration to lessors, 82—strong feeling of late, for the necessity for interference of Government, 82—impossibility of working mines with pecuniary advantage and certainty without records, 84—value of science in modern mining, 85—prospective view of our mining greatness, 86-7.

## N

*Norman*, Geo. Warde, Esq., review of his 'Examination of some prevailing Opinions on the Subject of Taxation in this and other Countries,' 451. See *Taxation*.

## O

*Observatories*, National, works relating to, 299—Greenwich observatory, 300—its early history, 300-1—practical astronomy, 302—the two Herschels, 303—gravitation, 304—parallax, 305—measurement of celestial spaces, 306-8—description of astronomical instruments, 308-11—altitude and azimuth circles, 311—great equatoreal telescopes, 312-13—Venice and Copenhagen observatories, 314—Römer, *ib.*—other early observatories, 315—that at Pulkowa, 316—history of Greenwich observatory, 317-18—Flamsteed, 318-19—Halley, 320—Bradley, 320-23—Dr. Bliss, 323—Dr. Maskelyne, *ib.*—Pond, 324—Professor Airy, 325—astronomical apparatus at

Greenwich, 325 *et seq.*—the time ball, 326—zenith tube room, 327—Bird's brazen quadrant, 328—Flamsteed's MSS., *ib.*—computing room, 329—transit room, *ib.*—astronomical clocks, 330—taking a transit, 331—circle room, 332—library, 333—chronometer room, 333—altitude and azimuth instruments, 335—magnetical and meteorological observatory, 337-8—photographic registration, 339—personal establishment, 341—system pursued for methodising and preserving observations for future reference, 342—Board of Visitors, 343—Mr. Airy's admirable method of *reduction*, 344—his lunar reductions, 345—his Annual Reports, 346—his method of overcoming the difficulties of the Canadian boundary survey, 347—his other labours, 348—'skeleton forms,' 349—assistants' duties, 349-51—personal equation, 351-53—printing department, 354—latest improvements in the apparatus, 355—postscript on Mr. Airy's 'Popular Lectures on Astronomy,' 356.

*Orange* processions, notice of works relating to, 87—discouraging effects of party-spirit in Ireland, *ib.*—notice of the late Orange riots, 88—Orange principles and practice, 88-9—accounts of former riots, 88-91—self-deception of the Orange leaders as to the noxious influence of party-spirit, 92—dissolution of the society, *ib.*—Sir Harcourt Lees, *ib.*—party feeling from 1836 to 1845, 93—government policy of 1845 offensive to Orangemen and the resumption of Orange meetings, 94—attempts of Government to quell the growing evil, *ib.*—magistrates superseded for attending party meetings, *ib.*—conduct of Lords Roden and Enniskillen and the Marquis of Downshire, *ib.*—offer of party services to government during the disturbances of 1848, 95—the Orange manifestation of that year, *ib.*—extracts from a letter from Lord Roden and notice of his proceedings, 95-7—Orange grievances, 97—counter-associations, 98—letter from Lord Massarene, 99—notoriety of Dolly's Brae, *ib.*—the Orange procession of last year, 100—precautionary measures, *ib.*—reception at Tollymore Park, 101—conflict at Magheramayo, 103—brutality of the Orange victors, 104—results of the procession, 105—magisterial inquiry, 106—accomplices among the magistrates, 107—illegality of armed assemblies, 109—remedy proposed by Lord Castlereagh for extinguishing party processions, 111—moral support of the existing law only needed, 112—true mission of the Anglo-Irish Church, 113—list showing the increase of illegal processions in the north of Ireland, 114—magisterial disqualification of partisanship, 115-16—advice of Lord Stanley and Sir R. Peel, 117—hope for the future, 118.

*Ortogrul*, notice of, 176.

*Ottoman* empire, foundation of, 175. See *Turkey*.

## P

*Pauperism*, its evils and proposed remedies, 2 *et seq.* See *Colonization*.

*Pisistratus*, 137. See *Grote*.

*Polynestans*, the distinct features of the tribes of, 443-4—decrease of the population, 445—Mr. Saxe Bannister's reasons for this decrease, 446 *note*—the 'Maori,' or New Zealanders, 447—statistics of popu

lation, 447-8—disproportion of the sexes, 449-50—effect of an excess of males, 451-2—empirical law suggested, 453-4—polygamy, 455—emigration of the sexes not proportional, 456—population of New Zealand, 457—Polynesia compared with the United States and Ireland, 458—causes of deficiency of females, 459-60—infanticide among savages, 461-2—wars of savages, 463-4—health of the New Zealanders, 465-6—cannibalism, 467—temperance of the Polynesians, 468—future prospects of New Zealand, 469-71.

## R

'*Revolution de 1848, Histoire de la,*' par A. de Lamartine, review of, 228. See *Lamartine*.

*Roden*, Lord, and the Orange processions, 88 *et seq.* See *Orange Processions*.

*Romanoff*, establishment of the House of, 199. See *Russia*.

*Russia*, its first encounter with the Turks, 196—sketch of the origin of the empire, 197—removal of its capital from Kiev to Vladimir, *ib.*—invasion of the Moguls, *ib.*—establishment of the Russian succession in the person of Ivan of Moscow, 198—consolidation of its power and foundation of the empire during the reign of the first Czar, Ivan the Great, *ib.*—failure of the House of Rurik, 199—establishment of the dynasty of Romanoff, *ib.*—its relations with Turkey, 199-201—declaration of war by Turkey against Russia, 202—defeat of the Turks, *ib.*—enumeration of the various stages of advancement of Russian boundaries to the south, 203—second declaration of war by Turkey, *ib.*—its fatal results to the Turks, *ib.*—apprehensions of Turkey at the growing power of Russia, 206. See *Turkey*.

## S

*Sanitary Reform*, late progress in, 210—its object, 211—economy of sanitary measures, 212—prejudices such measures have to encounter, 213—neglect of many of its details as vulgar, *ib.*—sanitary regulations of the Jews and Romans, 214—duty of property in towns, 215—relation between dirt and vice, 216-17—picture of a manufacturing town and suburbs, 218-19—Mr. Macaulay's description of what the most fashionable parts of London were in the time of Charles II., 219—constitution of the Board of Health, 220-22—local elective bodies, 223—local boards under control of the Board of Health, 224-5—security in centralization of power and responsibility, 225-6—local abusive interests, 227—importance of the middle classes understanding the question of sanitary reform, 228-9.

'*Shirley, a Tale,*' by Currer Bell, review of, 153—mental equality of the sexes considered, 154-5—excellence of female musicians, 156—of female *littérateurs*, 157—question of the authorship of 'Jane Eyre,' 158—its masculine vigour, *ib.*—inferiority of 'Shirley' to 'Jane Eyre,' 159—its harshness and incoherence, *ib.*—its unmistakable power, but rudeness and affectation, 161—specimens of its bold and poetic imagery, 162—graphic delineation of an interior, 163—infelicitous characters of its heroes, 163—fascination of its

- heroines, 164—its sins against truth and nature, 165—rhapsody on Milton's Eve, 167—powerful scene from 'Shirley,' 169-72—poetic power of the authoress, 172-3—application to Currer Bell of Schiller's remark on 'Corinne,' 173.
- Smith*, the late Rev. Sydney, review of his 'Elementary Sketches of 'Moral Philosophy,' 356—Lord Jeffrey's opinion of the work, 357-8—nature of the lectures, 359-60—extravagancies of metaphysicians, 361—scepticism falsely charged on metaphysics, 362—natural religion, 363—observations on the utility of the science of metaphysics, 364-5—the Rev. Sydney Smith's lectures on wit and humour, 365-71—on the beautiful, 371-5—faculties of animals and men and faculties of beasts, 375-6—characteristics of the work, 376-7.
- Solon*, Mr. Grote's account of the reforms and character of, 134-7. See *Grote*.
- Solyman* the Great, 187. See *Turkey*.
- Strzelecki*, Count, his evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords on the efficiency and success of Irish emigrants in Australia, 25. See *Colonization*.

## T

- Taxation*, British and Continental, works relating to, 471—British skill and intellect, 472—works of Thornton, Ricardo, Tooke, and Jones Loyd, 473—Mr. George Norman's valuable pamphlet, *ib.*—the 'groans of the Britons,' 474-5—amount of remitted taxes, 476—limits to taxation, 476-8—effect of taxation trenching upon capital, 478—proportion of population to taxation, 479-80—accumulation in England since the peace, 480-82—English finances compared with French, 483-4—with other foreign states, 485-6—financial condition of Ireland, 486-7—progressive reductions, 489—Mr. Norman's estimate of our colonial expenditure, 490—French and English colonies, 491-2—dangers from pauperism, 493—M. Thiers on the well-being of the labouring classes, 494-5—better application of taxes, 495-6.
- Treaty* of peace and friendship, the first struck between Turkey and a Christian state, 186. See *Turkey*.
- Turkey*, its past and present position among the states of Europe, 173—old prophecies regarding the decay of the Ottoman empire, 174—dawnings of Turkish power, 175—notice of Ortogrul, 176—his son, Osman, 177—conquests of the House of Osman, 177-8—relations between the Greeks and Turks, 179—origin and progress of the power of the Janizaries, 180—assumption of the title of Sultan by Bajazet I., *ib.*—Bajazet's unfortunate contest with Timour, 181—resumption of Turkish power in Asia, *ib.*—Mahomet I., *ib.*—his son, Amurath II., *ib.*—capture of Constantinople, *ib.*—importance of Constantinople to the growing power of the Turks, 182—feeling of alarm throughout Europe, 182-3—contests between the Europeans and Turks, 184—superiority of Turkish discipline and tactics over most of the European states, 184-5—gradual familiarity between the Turkish and Christian states, 185—campaigns in Persia and Egypt, 185—first Christian alliances, 186-9—strength

and grandeur of Turkey on its entry into the 'European system,' 190—Charles V. and Solymán, 191—subsequent history of Turkey and its connexion with Russia, 192-212. See *Russia*.

## V

*Vienna*, Turkish siege of, 195.

'*Village Notary*, the,' by Baron Eötvös, translated by M. Wenckstern, review of, 479—notice of the author, 498—the Hungarian landscape, 499—outline of the story of 'the Village Notary,' 500—distinction between Hungarian freemen and serfs, 501—state of the Jews in Hungary, 502-3—M. Wenckstern as a translator, 503.

## W

'*War upon the Wilderness*,' 47.

'*Water*, supply of, to the metropolis, list of works relating to, 377—Fitz-Stephen's account of London in the reign of Henry II., *ib.*—water supply at the time of the Conqueror, *ib.*—at later times, 378—Peter Morrice's contrivance for raising water at London Bridge, 378—Sir Hugh Middleton and the New River Company, 379—later water companies, 379—present supply of water, 380—sewage poured into the Thames, 381—quantity of organic matter in all London water, 382—consequences of water not being laid on, 383—connexion between physical uncleanness and moral pollution, 384—fever perpetuated from want of drainage, 385-6—districts of filth are districts of crime, 387—economy of a supply of good water, 388—table of comparative mortality, 389—necessity of legislating for the poor, 391—notice of several proposals for the supply of water of better quality, 392—the Thames and its tributaries, 393—report of Messrs. Walker and Leach, 394—combination and competition incompatible, 395—useless competition, 396—parliamentary inquiries, 397—inadequacy of the principles of trade, 398-9—amount of water-rents in the metropolis, 400—interest of all classes in the water question, 401—springs poisoned by contamination with cesspools, 402—state of Bermondsey, 403—supply of water at various places at home and abroad, 404-5—amongst the Romans, 405-6—works of beneficence immortal, 407-8.

## Z

*Zinghis Khan*, irruptions of, 176.

J'

END OF VOL. XCI.

LONDON :

SCOTT, SWOODS and SHAW,  
New-street-Square.











